

REV. DONALD PATRICK ROEMER

**DOCUMENTS PRODUCED BY THE ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES 2013
PURSUANT TO JCCP 4286 SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

Vicar for Clergy Database

Clergy Assignment Record (Detailed)

Mr Donald Patrick Roemer*Current Primary Assignment*

<i>Birth Date</i>	3/17/1944	<i>Age:</i>	68
<i>Birth Place</i>	Oxnard, California, USA	<i>Deanery:</i>	0
<i>Diaconate Ordination</i>			
<i>Priesthood Ordination</i>	5/23/1970		
<i>Diocese Name</i>	Archdiocese of Los Angeles		
<i>Date of Incardination</i>	4/1/1966		
<i>Religious Community</i>			
<i>Ritual Ascription</i>	Latin		
<i>Ministry Status</i>	To Lay State		
<i>Canon State</i>	Diocesan Priest	<i>Incard Process</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Begin Pension Date</i>			

<i>Home phone</i>	(714) 223-5829
<i>Cell phone</i>	(714) 309-0572
<i>Seminary</i>	St. John's Seminary, Camarillo
<i>Ethnicity</i>	American (USA)
<i>Language(s)</i>	<i>Fluency</i>
Spanish	Conversational Basics

Fingerprint Verification and Safeguard Training

Date Background Check
Virtus Training Date

Assignment History

<i>Assignment</i>	<i>Beginning Date</i>	<i>Completion Date</i>
Returned To Lay State, Rescript from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Protocol No. 165/2003.	5/9/2006	
Inactive Leave, Mail Returned. No current address	12/21/1989	5/8/2006
Sick Leave	2/1/1981	12/20/1989
St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church, Thousand Oaks Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	6/19/1978	1/31/1981
Chaplain, Active Service, Los Prietos Boys Camp, Santa Barbara	4/11/1977	6/18/1978
Coordinator, Active Service, Part-time coordinator, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Santa Barbara	8/15/1976	4/10/1977

Chaplain, Active Service, Santa Barbara Juvenile Hall	12/17/1975	4/10/1977
San Roque Catholic Church, Santa Barbara Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	6/17/1974	6/18/1978
St. Raphael Catholic Church, Santa Barbara Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	6/6/1970	6/16/1974

ATASCADERO STATE HOSPITAL

Samuel D. Yockey
Executive Director

REDACTED

Hospital Administrator

REDACTED

REDACTED

VISITORS

While the patient is a resident in this hospital there are rules and regulations all must work within. It is hoped by supplying family and friends with basic information, it will make the visit beneficial to all concerned.

The hospital supplies all clothing, meals, medications and other items necessary for the care and treatment of our patients. In addition we maintain a canteen operated for the benefit of patients through which permissible items may be purchased. By spending patient funds, i.e. cash, check, or money order, he may purchase the items he desires. Should you wish to give the patient a gift or package, you may send it through the mail or bring it to the hospital during regular visiting hours. (See Item J and "Acceptable Items," page 3).

VISITING AND CORRESPONDENCE INFORMATION

For information about a patient's progress, or these regulations, address inquiries to the following address:

REDACTED REDACTED
Atascadero State Hospital
Drawer A
Atascadero, California 93422

Should you make an inquiry by telephone, you may not receive the information you desire as there are laws preventing the disclosure of information without the patient's permission. (See Section 5328 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.) It would be best to write and to identify yourself, the name of the patient you are writing about, and to identify your relationship to the patient.

Patients may initiate telephone calls on a collect basis from within the hospital to their relatives and/or friends. Should the person receiving the call not wish to talk to the patient, they may simply refuse the collect call. Currently there are no provisions for patients to receive direct phone calls. However, it is possible to phone the hospital and request that the patient return the call. If it is an emergency, the caller shall describe the situation. The patient can usually return an emergency call within a half hour.

VISITINGWHO MAY VISIT

- A. Patients may receive visits from anyone unless their name appears on the NEGATIVE VISITING REGISTER, which is maintained at the Reception Desk. Names may only be placed on this list after the patient has been informed that his visits are being denied for good cause.

- B. Minors under the age of 16 years must be accompanied by a responsible visiting adult. There are no arrangements or facilities for the care of infants or small children by hospital staff.
- C. Former patients will visit in the Visiting Room unless previous approval to visit on the program within the security area of the hospital has been given by the Medical Director.

VISITING REGULATIONS

- A. Visitors are encouraged to visit on weekends and holidays so as not to interfere with a patient's treatment schedule. However, if you wish to talk to staff, it is best to schedule visits during the week. The Visiting Room is open daily from 8:30 A.M. to 3:00 P.M.
- B. Visitors who wish to see a staff member should so request when registering with the receptionist. This should be conducted during the work week. We suggest that requests for interviews with staff members be submitted prior to the date of visiting and allow the staff member sufficient time to arrange his or her schedule.
- C. Ordinarily all visiting takes place in the visiting room within the hospital. Patients with grounds privileges may have visits in the picnic area on Saturdays, Sundays, Tuesdays and holidays, providing the weather permits. Visitors of patients with grounds privileges may bring food for their own use in the picnic area. Patients may participate but may not bring food back into the hospital. Patients are not allowed to enter private automobiles.
- D. Box lunches can be purchased by those visiting through lunch hours by placing orders in the visiting room on arrival. Orders for lunch may be made up until 12:30 P.M.
- E. Please leave all unnecessary items at home or locked in your car, as all visitors must pass through a contraband detector before visiting. It is a violation to bring upon these grounds any firearms, intoxicating liquors, narcotics or drugs. No article of any kind may be given to a patient or received by a patient without prior permission.

NOTICE: All persons and vehicles entering these grounds are subject to search.

- ✓ F. Money in any form cannot be accepted in the visiting room. Monday through Friday it may be paid directly into the patient's account at the Trust Office, or it may be mailed at any time for the patient's account.
- G. Visitors bringing in cash are encouraged to have a supply of loose change for use in the visiting room. A canteen employee will be available to make change between 11:30 A.M. and 1:00 P.M. on a daily basis.
- H. Visitors should take care of all personal business before or after visiting hours. This will preclude the entering and exiting of the security area a great number of times.

- I. Visitors who wish to visit more than one patient at a time must receive approval prior to the scheduled visiting time. Approval for such visit will be obtained directly from the Program Director of the patients involved. This request should be made by the visitor.
- J. Any visitor wishing to leave packages or gifts for patients may do so through the Protective Services Department. Packages will be wrapped the same as for mailing and should not contain any item unacceptable in this hospital (including perishable foods). Packages will be accepted during the regular visiting hours, 8:30 A.M. to 3:00 P.M. daily. All packages will be checked by hospital staff in the patient's presence.
- K. Any exceptions to the foregoing regulations should be cleared in advance with the Program staff. The Hospital Peace Officer in charge may grant additional visiting on the basis of space and supervision available after receiving approval from the patient's ward.

ACCEPTABLE ITEMS

Afta After-Shave Lotion in plastic container
 Radio (battery-operated only); watch or electric razor
 No items operated with electric cords will be allowed
 Stamps, writing supplies and photographs (Except of patient by himself)
 Cigarettes, cigars and pipes
 Jackets or sweaters (Cardigan type)
 Batteries, wallet (metal clip removed) and Bible
 Containers will not be accepted unless they are factory-sealed with the seal unbroken.
 A patient cannot receive any canned or jar items except coffee, tea, Tang, non-dairy creamers or shelled nuts.

If a visitor wishes to give a patient an item other than those contained on this list, he should ascertain from hospital staff whether or not such items would be acceptable.

For items that will be utilized on the ward for the total ward patient population, the visitor should see the Coordinator of Volunteer Services. This would include such items as very large birthday cakes, sheet cakes, and food for ward parties.

CONDUCT OF VISITORS

The conduct of both visitors and patients upon greeting one another and during the visit shall be socially acceptable, and shall not be offensive to other visitors and patients in the visiting room. Even though there are no set guidelines, those individuals who feel other visitors and patients are not conducting themselves in a proper manner shall report any incident to the Protective Services Officer in charge. The immediate incident will be handled by him and a decision made as to whether or not the visit should continue or be concluded.

The visitors shall wear appropriate dress, both in the picnic area and in the visiting room. There are no set guidelines as to appropriate dress, but it shall

be construed as clothing which is in good taste and not subject to question by the Reception Desk or the Protective Services Officer.

When visitors picnic with patients in the areas provided, please remember that liquid fuel stoves cannot be allowed as there is a high fire hazard in this area. Charcoal burning stoves may be used at picnic area tables.

Children must be properly supervised by responsible visiting adults at all times while on the hospital grounds or in the visiting room. Please do not leave children or pets unattended in the vehicle.

✓ No items may be passed between the visitor and the patient. This includes food, cigarettes, checks, money, medication of any kind, and legal papers. Legal papers must be given to the patient through the Trust Office.

CORRESPONDENCE

Patients may correspond with friends and relatives as often as they wish. Relatives and friends of long standing are encouraged to maintain contact through correspondence and visiting. A patient is expected to furnish his own postage; however, letters will be mailed free for patients without funds. Outgoing mail is not censored. Incoming letters are opened by the patient in the presence of an employee and cash and checks are turned over to the employee for deposit to the patient's account. The patient may draw money from his account for his personal use in the form of scrip.

ACCOMMODATIONS

Atascadero State Hospital is located midway between San Francisco and Los Angeles, three miles south of Atascadero on Highway 101. A visitors' parking area is provided for persons traveling by private auto.

A Greyhound Bus Depot is located in Atascadero, approximately three miles from the hospital. If traveling by Greyhound, ask the bus driver if he can stop at the front entrance to the hospital.

Airline connections may be made at Paso Robles, 15 miles to the north, or San Luis Obispo, 17 miles to the south; however, no local public transportation is available.

While there are no public eating facilities at the hospital, visitors planning to remain at the hospital between visiting periods may bring their own lunch (to be eaten outside the visiting room), purchase a box lunch in the visiting room, or travel to local restaurants, but none are within walking distance.

Hotel and motel facilities are located in Atascadero, three miles north.

5706

Checks should be made out as follows:

ATASCADERO STATE HOSPITAL - Patients' Account

For account of _____.

Page 8—NEWS CHRONICLE, Thousand Oaks, Calif., Tuesday, April 23, 1980

newschronicle

living

Father Pat gives his heart and ears to the children

BY N KLODT

Every child needs aaron outside their home life who's absolutely crazy but them. This bit of informality smothering the Rev. Donald



Listening to problems of youth and presenting them from different angles has made The Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer many friends, above.

News Chronicle photo by Brad Grayson

Patrick Roemer picked up from a book and has kept in mind and practice. He hopes that sometimes it might just be him who can help out.

Roemer, or as he is commonly referred to as "Father Pat," has been commended for his work with Conejo youth as the 1980 Parish Teacher Association Honorary Service Award recipient him to the PTA's attention was drawn to several public schools as a guest during lunch hour. He's here as a sounding board, an interested listener to whatever students want to talk about.

"I'm not there to convert kids. It's my way of showing an interest in the community plus I really enjoy working with kids," said Roemer softly. "In fact, there are hardly ever any questions asked of me concerning religion at the schools," he added.

Roemer is available not only on campus but at sporting events and outings. This includes work with the youth ministry staff at his parish, St. Paschal Bayton Catholic Church. He figures about half of his ministry work is with youth, and those of junior high age are his favorites. "I've got one foot in childhood and the other in adolescence," he added, noting they seem responsive most of the time. But all youth are trying to balance church, family and friends and pull up with peer pressure, says Roemer.

"I see a growing lack of confidence in parents from youth today," he says seriously. "Kids aren't listening to them." His approach is to listen, respect their feelings and get them to reflect on the situation, seeing different angles, not giving specific answers.

Roemer's profession takes a tremendous amount of patience, "and sometimes I really do get frustrated. I might say 'I don't know' to consider how they might feel. I don't know if that's a child but I understand their feelings."

He figures that even if he can't get young people to accept him, Roemer might at least be one in a chain of people touching their lives with some help and love.

One reason the young priest has made so many friends in Conejo youth circles is his sense of humor and candid, at-ease personality. Students usually toss a few jokes his way because of the Roman collar which they refer to as a flea collar. Roemer goes right along with them and, when they want a closer look, he removes it from his uniform and starts to scratch the nape.

Roemer's work with adults as well as youth provides him with satisfaction. The priest adds that he's never felt wearing the uniform has blocked or added effectiveness in his work. And Roemer doesn't always wear it.

Many of Roemer's young friends over his 10 years in the priesthood have given him T-shirts. Their messages never fail to bring a smile to his face. A few include: "I am an unwed father," "Father knows best," "The Incredible Father Hulk," "Little Priest on the Prairie," and "Good Guys Wear Black." He likes to compare his work to the movie title "Being There" — "for people or for kids, that's what it's all about," he concluded.

CHILD MOLESTATION: THE PROBLEM
AND A PROPOSED SOLUTION



5570

MICHAEL D. BRADBURY — DISTRICT ATTORNEY — VENTURA COUNTY



OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY

County of Ventura, State of California

MICHAEL D. BRADBURY
District Attorney

ROBERT C. BRADLEY
Chief Deputy District Attorney
RAYMOND J. SINETAR
Assistant District Attorney
MAL G. KING
Chief Investigator

November 11, 1980

Assembly Criminal Justice Committee Members
Interim Hearings on Child Molestation

Members:

Our laws insufficiently protect our children. Although we place the highest priority upon their education and physical health, we downgrade their freedom from sexual molestation.

In California, if you sexually molest a child your chances of avoiding a prison sentence are four times better than if you had raped an adult woman. In fact, molesting a child, you have a 60% chance of obtaining probation.

This comparative leniency occurs despite the gravity of the crime. In fact, the victims of child molestation have been described by Dr. Roland Summit as "psychological time bombs."

Child molesters not sentenced to prison are frequently committed to state hospitals where, after 18 months, on the average, they are released as "non-dangerous." Yet, the scientific community is virtually unanimous that it is incapable of determining "non-dangerousness."

Our laws can be revised to better protect our children. These hearings are a promising first step.

Very truly yours,

Michael D. Bradbury
MICHAEL D. BRADBURY
District Attorney

jo

5571

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
CHILD MOLESTATION, AN OVERVIEW	1
THE INCIDENCE OF CHILD MOLESTATION IS SIGNIFICANT AND SERIOUSLY UNDERREPORTED	5
CHILD MOLESTATION IS A PARTICULARLY SERIOUS OFFENSE	8
THE MDSO INCARCERATION PHILOSOPHY IS OUTMODED AND APPEARS PSYCHIATRICALY UNSOUND	14
CURRENT CHILD MOLESTATION SENTENCING PATTERNS ARE INAPPROPRIATE	22
SENTENCES IMPOSED UPON CONVICTION, STATEWIDE, 1979	23
INADEQUACY OF PRESENT CALIFORNIA LAW	24
RECOMMENDED LEGISLATIVE REFORM	29

not enclosed

CHILD MOLESTATION, AN OVERVIEW

Child molestation is defined in the Penal Code as any lewd or lascivious act upon the body of a child under the age of 14 years where the perpetrator is motivated by a sexual intent. This statute would apply to pedophiles who molest children.

Little seems to be known about the causes or the dynamics of pedophilia. Consequently, psychiatry cannot effectively deal with its diagnosis, treatment or cure.

Pedophiles tend to have a circumscribed age preference range. This offender is sometimes referred to as "fixated." The fixated offender is described by Dr. Roland Summit of Harbor-UCLA Medical Center as a person who:

[K]nows that his love affair with a given child is time limited and that his compelling sexual attraction will turn to indifference or even repulsion within a few years. The appearance in the child of secondary sexual characteristics is like the stroke of midnight for Cinderella. The experienced pedophile learns to replace the fading attraction of each relationship with a succession of younger initiates. An active pedophile may have contact with hundreds, even thousands of children within his lifetime.

Summit, R., Recognition and Treatment of Child Sexual Abuse, p. 4 (1980), Pending publication.

Molesters victimize young boys at least as frequently as young girls. Summit, supra at p. 4. Swift, C., "Research Into Violent Behavior: Overview and Sexual Assaults," Hearings Before Subcommittee on Domestic and International, Scientific Planning, Analysis and Cooperation. U.S. House of Representatives, 95th Cong. 2d Sess. (Jan. 10-2 , 1978). (Hereinafter cited as "Congressional Hearings.") The average female victim is eight years old at the time of initiation, but many are only two or three years old, or even younger. Boys are not infrequently victimized during years 1-8, but are most at risk during ages 9 to 13. Summit, supra at p. 4.

It is generally acknowledged within the mental health profession that the causes of pedophilia are yet to be clearly ascertained. Summit suggests that "fixated" pedophilia may:

[R]esult from trauma, as in a pre-adolescent sexual assault, or from excessive stimulation, such as an affectionate childhood relationship with a pedophile. In other cases there is no discernible reason for the fixation. As with other types of sexual paraphilias, theories of etiology remain diverse and controversial. Whatever the causes may be, it is important to recognize that pedophilia can exist as a disorder of sexual object choice, without associated disorders of thought, affect or behavior.

Summit, supra at p. 7.

Pedophilia may not be a mental illness. Dr. Nicholas A. Groth, Director of the Sex Offender Program for the State of Connecticut, states that "few sexual offenders against children are

demonstrably psychotic in any obvious way . . ." Groth, "Guidelines for the Assessment and Management of the Offender," p. 30 (1978). Many experts would agree that pedophilia is essentially a lifestyle which never changes.

At a minimum, the system's current faith in psychiatry as a solution to the problem should be coupled with some modesty.

The view that sexual crime is usually the expression of mental abnormality is often incorrect -- although the intensity of the sexual urge is sometimes sufficient to cause the sexual offender to defy the penalty he may incur, the same choice is made by many thieves and fraudulent persons and by many aggressive offenders who are rightly held to be responsible. It is unfortunate that academic theorists whose knowledge is culled from books and not from experience are not aware of these simple facts.

McGeorge, J., "Sexual Assaults on Children," Medicine, Science and Law, p. 250 (October 1964).

For almost every theory advanced about pedophilia, one can find an opposite conclusion reached by a different expert. However, there is expert agreement on the following principles:

1. Child molestation is more widespread than is commonly perceived;
2. Child molestation is vastly underreported;
3. Serious child molestation offenses often lead to long-term detrimental emotional problems for the victim;
4. There is no certainty as to the causes of pedophilia;

5575

5. There is no known cure for pedophilia at the present time;
6. There is no reliable clinical ability to predict dangerousness; and
7. The true or "fixated" pedophile is quite likely to reoffend.

THE INCIDENCE OF CHILD MOLESTATION IS SIGNIFICANT
AND SERIOUSLY UNDERREPORTED

No official national or statewide figures on the incidence of the molestation of children are available. This deficiency exists for several reasons. First, child molestation is probably the most significantly underreported crime against the person. As noted by Dr. Roland Summit of Harbor-UCLA Medical Center, studies indicate that no more than 6 percent of all child molestations are reported to authorities. Summit, R. and Kryso, J., "Sexual Abuse of Children: A Clinical Spectrum," 48 Amer. J. Orthopsychiatry, p. 228 (April 1978). Second, some of the incidents which are reported to police do not result in arrests. Monahan, Dr. J., Congressional Hearings, p. 203-5 (1978). Third, most agencies which collect offense and arrest statistics do not report child molestation in any specific crime category. For example, child molestation is not separately reported on either the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports or the reports compiled by the California Department of Justice, Bureau of Criminal Statistics. Typically, child molestation is lumped into the category of either "other sex offenses" or "other felonies." This deficiency also says much about the criminal justice system's attitude toward child molestation.

5577

In the absence of meaningful official statistics, researchers have relied upon retrospective interview data. This data results from a series of surveys administered by various experts to mature individuals, gathering information about instances where they were molested sexually as children. The results of these surveys were summarized for the United States Congress by Dr. Caroline Swift of the Wyandot Mental Health Center in Lawrence, Kansas:

Estimates based on surveys [i.e., retrospective interviews] indicate that between 25-35 percent of females are sexually victimized in this country (Kinsey, 1973; Landis, 1956; Gagnon, 1970), and 5-30 percent of males (Landis, 1956; Brunold, 1964; Lloyd, 1976).

Congressional Hearings, p. 332.

As Dr. Swift summarized to Congress, these studies conclude that, "In terms of incidence, the retrospective studies seemed to indicate that between one-fourth and one-third of our entire population has been sexually exploited while growing up, and that's both boys and girls." Congressional p. 352.

The reasons for the severe level of initial underreporting of child molestations were varied and set forth by Dr. Swift in her testimony. The major cause for underreporting is the severe taboo which society places on these cases. Thus, often the child or the parents of the child, once they are aware of the offense, do not report it to authorities. Additionally, in a significant number of the cases, the

5578

parent or stepparent of the child is the perpetrator and obviously can exercise great control over whether the matter ever comes to the authorities' attention. Studies indicate that the level of underreporting is particularly acute amongst molested boys. Swift, C., Congressional Hearings, p. 352-353 (1978).

CHILD MOLESTATION IS A PARTICULARLY SERIOUS OFFENSE

Child molestation often does not result in the infliction of physical injury upon the victim. For this reason it has sometimes been treated as a nonserious assault. Yet, the trauma and long-term psychological effects upon its victims often exceed that suffered by rape victims. Swift, Dr. C., Congressional Hearings, p. 343-8.

Contrary to some earlier assumptions, studies now show that child molest victims suffer serious long-term psychological detriments. Id. Dr. Joseph Peters, Director of the Philadelphia Sex Offender and Rape Victim Center, and Associate Professor at the University of Pennsylvania, summarized some of these detriments as:

- ° General emotional withdrawal from society;
- ° Loss of appetite;
- ° Discontinuation of education;
- ° Negative feelings toward men;
- ° Severe nightmares;
- ° Loss of sleep.

Importantly, the initial trauma inherent in a serious molestation often leads to serious life-long emotional problems for the victim. Dr. Roland Summit of Harbor-UCLA Medical Center,

characterized these molestation victims as "psychological time bombs," suffering from: "self-hate, self-destructive, antisocial behaviors, substance abuse, runaway tendencies, prostitution, somatic complaints, sexual dysfunctions, hysterical seizures, dissociative disorders including multiple personality states, and homicidal frenzies, affective disorders and schizophrenia." Summit, R., Recognition and Treatment of Child Sexual Abuse, p. 3 (1980).

These symptoms were particularly aggravated when the offender was an intimate authority figure, such as father or stepfather. Peters, J., "Children who are victims of sexual assault and the psychology of offenders," 30 Amer. J. Psychotherapy, 398 (July 1976).

Society at large may be the greater victim, because studies now strongly correlate child molestation victimization with subsequent child molestation perpetration. Molest victims, as adults, become molest offenders (men), or aiders and abettors in molestations or child abusers (men and women). Swift, Dr. C., Congressional Hearings, p. 353-4; Summit, R. and Kryso, J., "Sexual Abuse of Children: A Clinical Spectrum," 48 Amer. J. Orthopsychiatry, p. 232 (April 1978).

Child molestation is also a serious crime because perpetrators (particularly fixated pedophiles) commonly are recidivists. Groth, Dr. A. N. and Longo, B. C., Undetected Recidivism Among Rapists and Child Molesters, p. 15-18 (Pub. Pend. 1980).

Pedophilia is a self-reinforcing sexual lifestyle. It produces physical and emotional pleasure. Thus, repetition increases the probability of repetition. Groth, A. N., Burgess, A. W., Holmstrom, L. L., and Sgroi, S., The Sexual Assault of Children and Adolescents, p. 153 (Lexington Books, 1978).

Because of this, as Dr. Summit has noted, supra, the typical fixated pedophile may molest hundreds or perhaps thousands of children during his lifetime.

One fact emphasized by recent studies is that the pronounced recidivism rates of child molesters cannot be measured by subsequent formal criminal record studies, based upon "arrests" or "convictions."

Dr. John Monahan, Assistant Professor, Department of Psychiatry, University of California, Irvine, stated the reasons for criminal record inadequacies as follows:

[P]olice arrest rates have been the primary means of verifying whether or not a violent act has occurred during the followup period. For at least two reasons, however, arrest rates are inadequate methods of verification: Most violent behavior is never reported to the police, and the violent behavior which is reported often does not lead to the recording of an arrest.

On the first point, a recent victimization study in eight major American cities found that only 40 to 50 percent of all violent crime was reported to the police. The reporting rate for simple assaults ranged from 27 to 39 percent (Department of Justice, 1974). While the reasons for not reporting a crime are varied . . . the result of underreporting is surely to reduce the usefulness of arrest records as a means of verifying the occurrence of violent behavior (Holatyn, 1975).

Added to this is the fact that the "clearance rate" of reported crime . . . is far from perfect. While the clearance rate for murder is reasonably high (79 percent) the clearance rates for forcible rape (51 percent), aggravated assault (63 percent) and robbery (27 percent) are such that a large portion of the violent crime that is reported never finds its way into police statistics (Kelley, 1974).

In addition to the standard reasons given to account for the low clearance rates for violent crime . . . one factor especially relevant to validation studies of the prediction of sexual violence is that mental hospitalization is often used by the police as an alternative to arrest. As Cacozza & Steadman (1974, p. 1013) noted in their followup study of the "criminally insane," Baxstrom [sexual] patients, "some of the patients were rehospitalized for behavior very similar to that displayed by other patients who were arrested for violent crimes."

One Los Angeles study found that 33 percent of police referrals to a medical psychiatric unit had as their primary precipitating incident "some degree of aggressive behavior." In none of these cases was an arrest made (Jacobson, Craven & Kushner, 1973).

Monahan, Dr. J., Congressional Hearings, p. 203-5 (1978).

Dr. Monahan thus concluded that most studies resting upon formal arrest or conviction reviews of "cured" sexual offenders are actually examining persons who "may be leading active careers in violent crime." Id. at 205.

Three hundred of America's leading psychiatrist concurred with Dr. Monahan's findings as they specifically relate to pedophiles. They concluded that studies resting upon formal "rates of recidivism [are] hardly reliable standards based on the innumerable criminal acts that occur and that do not receive official recognition. Prominent among these would be rape and pedophilia, which are underreported." Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, Psychiatry and Sex Psychopath Legislation: The 30's to the 80's, p. 870 (Mental Health Materials Center, N.Y., 1977) (Hereafter cited as "300 Psychiatrists' Report").

Recently, Dr. A. Nicholas Groth concluded the actual recidivism rate of child molesters was over five times that reflected by formal criminal records. This 500 percent underrecording rate was limited to molestations of separate victims (multiple criminal incidents with the same victim were not counted because they were so frequent as to significantly skew the sample). Groth, A. N. and Longo, B. C., Undetected Recidivism Among Rapists and Child Molesters, p. 23 (Pub. Pend. 1980).

Professor George Dix of the University of Texas, in a national institute of mental health study of Atascadero inmates similarly found serious underrecording of the crimes actually committed by California MDSO's. Dix, G. E., "Differential Processing of Abnormal Sex Offenders," 67 J. Crim. L. & Criminology, p. 233 (1976).

The conclusions of Doctors Groth and Dix should not be surprising in light of recent studies which conclude that no more than 6 percent of all child molestations have been reported to authorities. Summit, R. and Kryso, J., "Sexual Abuse of Children: A Clinical Spectrum," 48 Amer. J. Orthopsychiatry, p. 228 (April 1978).

THE MDSO INCARCERATION PHILOSOPHY IS OUTMODED
AND APPEARS PSYCHIATRICALY UNSOUND

Until 1976, California clung to a rehabilitation incarceration philosophy in dealing with crimes, generally. "Rehabilitation" determined sentence length. Achievement of "rehabilitation and adjustment" caused release. See former Penal Code section 3024.5

This system did not work. Some offenders were released too early as rehabilitated (i.e., false negatives); others were held too long as not rehabilitated (i.e., false positives).

Most important, criminal rehabilitation did not occur. This California experience was not unique. Dr. James Q. Wilson of Harvard University summarized the national research findings:

Between 1966 and 1972, Robert Martinson reviewed, initially at the request of the New York State Governor's Committee on Criminal Offenders, 231 experimental studies on the treatment of criminals, including in this list all those from here and abroad that were available in print between 1945 and 1967, and that met various tests of methodological adequacy. Martinson's review came to a clear conclusion: "With few and isolated exceptions, the rehabilitation efforts that have been reported so far have no appreciable effect on recidivism." Studies done since 1967 do not provide grounds for altering that conclusion significantly.

It does not seem to matter what form of treatment in the correctional system is attempted -- whether vocational training or academic education; whether counseling inmates individually in groups, or not at all; whether therapy is administered by social workers or psychiatrists; whether the institutional context of the treatment is custodial or benign; whether the sentences are short or long; whether the person is placed on probation or released on parole; whether the treatment takes place in the community or in institutions. Indeed, some forms of treatment -- notably a few experiments with psychotherapy -- actually produced an increase in the rate of recidivism.

The Martinson review is unique in its comprehensiveness, but not in its findings. R. G. Hood came to much the same conclusion in a review published in 1967; Walter C. Bailey, after examining 100 studies of the efficacy of treatment and especially the 50 or so that claimed positive results, concluded in 1966 that the "evidence supporting the efficacy of correctional treatment is slight, inconsistent, and a questionable reliability. Leslie T. Wilkins observed in 1969 that "the major achievement of research in the field of social psychology and treatment has been negative and has resulted in the undermining of nearly all of the current mythology regarding the effectiveness of treatment in any form."

In retrospect, little of this should have been surprising. It requires not merely optimistic, but heroic assumptions about the nature of man to lead one to suppose that a person, finally sentenced after (in most cases) many brushes with the law, and having devoted a good part of his youth and young adulthood to misbehavior of every sort, should, by either the solemnity of prison or the skillfulness of the counselor, come to see the error of his ways and to experience a transformation of his character. Today, we smile in amusement at the naivete of those early prison reformers who imagined that religious instruction while in solitary confinement would lead to moral regeneration. How they would now smile at us at our presumption that conversations with a psychiatrist or a return to the community could achieve the same end. We have learned how difficult it is by governmental means to improve the educational attainments of children or to restore stability and affection to the family, and in these

cases we are often working with willing subjects in moments of admitted need. Criminal rehabilitation requires producing equivalent changes in unwilling subjects under conditions of duress or indifference.

J. Q. Wilson, Thinking About Crime, (Basic Books 1974), 169-70. (Footnotes omitted.)

Dr. Alfred Blumstein of Carnegie Mellon University and Chairman of the National Academy of Science's Panel on Research on Deterrent and Incapacitative Effects, similarly told Congress in 1978:

The results of these evaluations of rehabilitation programs have been strikingly consistent. Wherever the evaluation has been rigorous, the evaluators appear to have found no discernible difference in the post-treatment recidivism of the treatment group compared to the controlled group. This is not to say that some programs do not help some people, but it does emphasize that we still do not know enough to be able to target specific programs at specific offenders with the confidence that these programs will "rehabilitate" them to a sizeable degree. No "silver bullets" have yet been identified that are potent enough to cure large numbers of offenders, at least within the confines of what the criminal justice system is able to do.

Blumstein, A., Congressional Hearings, p. 146.


The Legislature recognized the failure of the rehabilitation detention philosophy when it enacted the determinate sentencing law (SB 42).

We now recognize the legitimate purpose of incarceration as punishment. The length of punishment should be uniform and

proportionate to the seriousness of the offense. Penal Code section 1170(a)(1). The MDSO system contradicts this general philosophy. Here this group of convicted offenders are, "treated not as criminals, but as sick persons." W&I Code section 6250.

Thus, aside from life sentences and CRC, the MDSO system remains the only adult system incarcerating offenders on a nonuniform, nonproportionate basis. The longest presumptive incarceration term under MDSO is the maximum for the substantive offense. W&I Code section 6316. On an ad hoc basis, this can be shortened on a staff conclusion of "cure." W&I Code section 6325.1. It may also be temporarily extended beyond the maximum on a staff conclusion of continued need and amenability to treatment. W&I Code section 6316.2.

In practice, the MDSO system has abbreviated rather than lengthened the confinement. The National Institute of Mental Health Study conducted by Professor George Dix of the University of Texas found that half of all the Atascadero inmates were released within one year and none were retained longer than two. Dix, G. E., "Determining the Continued Dangerousness of Psychologically Abnormal Sex Offenders," 3 J. of Psychiatry and Law, p. 327 (1975).



More recent studies show that Atascadero confinement length has increased somewhat, but still significantly lags behind comparable confinement length for state prison. A 1978 State Department of Mental Health Task Force report stated that the average length of hospitalization for MDSO's at that time was 18 months. Horowitz, J., "Sex Offenders and the Disordered," Los Angeles Times (Part IV, August 3, 1979). Data produced by the Department of Corrections disclosed that in 1978 the comparable confinement length for child molesters in prison was 41 months. Management Information Section, Department of Corrections, Number and Time Served in Prison Before First Parole, p. 3 (April 1980).

The release decisions were based upon the hospital staff's assessment of the MDSO's continued dangerousness to others. This standard (which is the premise of the MDSO system) is now widely recognized as psychiatrically incapable of implementation.

The Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, an independent group of 300 leading psychiatrists, recently published a white paper entitled, Psychiatry and Sex Psychopath Legislation: The 30's to the 80's.

Two significant conclusions of GAP's 125-page study were:

(1) First and foremost, sex psychopath and sexual offender statutes can best be described as approaches that have failed. The discrepancy between the promises in sex statutes and performances have rarely been resolved.

* * *

(2) The categorization process projected by sexual psychopath statutes lacks clinical validity. The notion is naive and confusing that a hybrid amalgam of law in psychiatry can validly label a person as a "sex psychopath" or "sex offender" and then treat him in a manner consistent with a guarantee of community safety. The mere assumption that such a heterogeneous legal classification could define treatability and make people amenable to treatment is not only fallacious; it is startling. It is analogous to approaches that would create special categories of "burglary offender" statutes or "white collar" offender statutes and then provide for special commitments, such as to burglary psychopath hospitals.

300 Psychiatrists Report, p. 935.

More fundamentally, GAP found no present psychiatric cure, or "silver bullet" (in Dr. Blumstein's terms) for pedophilia.

At one time, pedophilia was thought to be highly treatable; in retrospect, this optimism appears to have confused social policy needs with actual therapeutic effectiveness.

300 Psychiatrists Report, p. 871.

Dr. Summit also saw no "silver bullet" for pedophiles:

Despite the hopes of penologists and therapists, there is no responsible documentation that treatment can realign the sexual preference of the fixated pedophile or deem any protections for the children at risk. Since the well-adjusted pedophile typically finds an unrestricted supply of noncomplaining partners there is no means short of 24-hour-supervision to monitor [his actions].

Summit, R., Recognition and Treatment of Child Sexual Abuse, p. 5, (1980).

GAP concurs with this conclusion:

Early and unjustified optimism had raised public hopes about the effectiveness of clinical approaches in identifying and predicting just who would behave in a deviant or dangerous manner. Intimately fused with the belief in the ability of clinicians to identify and predict sexual psychopathy for the legal system was the illusion that treatments were available to cure and rehabilitate the individuals identified.

300 Psychiatrists Report, p. 854.

As another prominent psychiatrist stated:

The difficulty is that we have no way of successfully treating the sexual psychopath. Cures, if any, must be extremely rare. The demand, therefore, that these offenders be "treated" is a sterile one. Why do we want jurisdiction in these cases transferred from the courts to the psychiatrist? It looks as if we have talked ourselves into the privilege of holding the bear by the tail.

Davidson, Dr. H., "Legislation Dealing with Sex Offenders," Amer. J. of Psychiatry (November 1959).

Professor Dix, in his NIMH study of Atascadero, observed that the Atascadero staff was confronting exactly the problems outlined above:

Perhaps the immediately apparent aspect of the staff's analysis of continued dangerousness was their frequent failure to address the issues specifically -- or when it was directly addressed -- with precision. No effort was spent discussing in specific or precise terms how likely it was that a patient would reoffend if released to the community. This, of course, merely confirms the frequently made suggestion that the prediction of dangerousness -- even in the institutional context where the staff can be regarded as well informed -- is so imprecise a matter as to inherently preclude such specific analysis on a statistical probability basis.

Dix, G. E., "Determining the Continued Dangerousness of Psychologically Abnormal Sex Offenders," J. of Psychiatry and Law, p. 235 (1975).

1 MICHAEL D. BRADBURY
District Attorney
2 JOSEPH E. TAYLOR
Deputy District Attorney
3 800 South Victoria Avenue
Ventura, CA 93009
4
5 Telephone (805) 654-2518
6 Attorney for Plaintiff
7

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF VENTURA
9

10	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)	
)	COURT NO.
11	Plaintiff,)	
)	
12	vs.)	STATEMENT OF FACTS
)	
13	DONALD PATRICK ROEMER,)	
)	
14	Defendant.)	
)	

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

	TOPICAL INDEX	
		PAGE
1		
2		
3	INTRODUCTION	1
4	STATEMENT OF FACTS	2
5	COUNT I: REDACTED PC 288(a)	2
6	Report of VSO Deputy Bruce McDowell	2
7	Statement of Mr. REDACTED	2
8	Statement of Mrs. REDACTED	2
9	Statement of REDACTED	2
10	First Contact With Donald Patrick Roemer	4
11	Report of VSO Detective Kelli McIlvain	4
12	Statement of REDACTED	4
13	Statement of Mrs. REDACTED	4
14	STATEMENT OF DONALD PATRICK ROEMER	5
15	Verbatim Transcript of <u>Miranda</u> Admonition	8
16	Report of District Attorney Investigator Pete Smart	9
17	Statement of REDACTED	9
18	Statement of REDACTED	10
19		
20	COUNT II: REDACTED PC 288(a)	11
21	Report of VSO Deputy Bruce McDowell	11
22	Report of District Attorney Investigator Pete Smart	11
23		
24	COUNT III: REDACTED PC 288(a)	12
25	Statement of REDACTED to VSO Sergeant Jack Hughes	12
26	Statement of REDACTED to District	
27	Attorney Invesgigator Pete Smart	13
28		

	<u>PAGE</u>
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

COUNT IV: REDACTED	PC 288(a)	14
Statement of REDACTED	to VSO Sergeant	14
Jack Hughes		
Statement of REDACTED	to District	15
Attorney Investigator Pete Smart		
COUNT V: REDACTED	PC 288(a)	16
Statement of Mrs. REDACTED		16
mother) to VSO Detective Kelli McIlvain		
Efforts by District Attorney's Office to		17
Interview REDACTED		
COUNT VI: REDACTED	PC 288(a)	18
Statement of REDACTED	to VSO Detective	18
Kelli McIlvain		
Statement of REDACTED	to District Attorney	18
Investigator		
Statement of Mrs. REDACTED	to District	19
Attorney Investigator Pete Smart		
COUNT VII: REDACTED	PC 288(a)	20
Statement of REDACTED	to VSO Detective	20
Kelli McIlvain		
Statement of REDACTED	to District Attorney	21
Investigator Pete Smart		
COUNT VIII: REDACTED	PC 288(a)	22
Report of VSO Deputy Joseph Cipollini		22
Statement of REDACTED		22
Statement of REDACTED	(REDACTED's mother)	23
Report of VSO Detective Tom Odle		23
Statement of REDACTED		23

	<u>PAGE</u>
1	
2	Statement of REDACTED 23
3	Report of VSO Lt. Braden McKinley 24
4	Contact with Father REDACTED 24
5	Sacred Heart
6	Contact with REDACTED and discussion 24
7	concerning Father REDACTED
8	Report of District Attorney Investigator 24
9	Pete Smart
10	Statement of Mrs. REDACTED 25
11	Statement of REDACTED 25
12	Statement of REDACTED concerning 26
13	conversations with Father REDACTED
14	Efforts to Interview Father REDACTED 27
15	
16	ADDITIONAL VICTIMS 28
17	A. REDACTED 28
18	Statement of REDACTED to VSO 28
19	Detective Kelli McIlvain
20	Statement of REDACTED to District 28
21	Attorney Investigator Pete Smart
22	B. REDACTED 30
23	Statement of REDACTED to VSO 30
24	Detective Kelli McIlvain
25	C. REDACTED 30
26	Statement of REDACTED to VSO Sergeant 30
27	Jack Hughes
28	D. REDACTED 31
	Report of VSO Deputy William Montijo 31
	Efforts to locate and interview REDACTED 31
	REDACTED

	<u>PAGE</u>
1	
2	Statement of REDACTED 31
3	
4	E. REDACTED 32
5	Report of VSO Detective Kelli McIlvain 32
6	Statement of REDACTED Director of Special Education, Conejo Valley Unified School District 32
7	Efforts to contact REDACTED 32
8	Statement of REDACTED, Teacher of Special Education 32
9	
10	
11	EXHIBIT "A"
12	Verbatim transcript of first 30 minutes of taped statement of Donald Patrick Roemer
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

INTRODUCTION

The following "Statement of Facts" prepared by the People of the State of California includes all statements taken in the case by investigators of the Ventura County Sheriff's Department and the Ventura County District Attorney's Office.

The material is organized by the order of the charges filed in the Information, and statements relating to uncharged victims are included under the heading "Additional Victims."

A verbatim transcript of the statement of Donald Patrick Roemer is marked Exhibit "A," attached, and incorporated herein by reference.

This "Statement of Facts" is submitted by the People of the State of California as proof of the factual basis of the pleas of nolo contendere by Donald Patrick Roemer to Counts I, II, and III of the Information.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

COUNT I: REDACTED

On January 26, 1981, the Ventura County Sheriff's Office, East Valley Station, received a report of a possible child molest from a Mrs. REDACTED, REDACTED REDACTED

Deputy Bruce McDowell responded to the call. He reported:

On 1-26-81 at about 1935 hours, I arrived at the victim's home re: a possible child molest. I contacted the victim's parents who gave this account: Mr. REDACTED told me that on 1/26/81 at about 1800 hours, victim REDACTED and the family were eating dinner. REDACTED told the family about the following incident: On 1/26/81, REDACTED went to CCD classes. Suspect, Father Patrick Roemer, asked REDACTED to look at some old pictures. REDACTED said that Father Roemer rubbed REDACTED stomach and then his "doofer." Mr. REDACTED told me that "doofer" means penis in their family. REDACTED said that Father Roemer started to shake. REDACTED said he was scared.

Mrs. REDACTED told me that REDACTED has a teacher and a helper in the CCD class. They are Mrs. REDACTED REDACTED and Mrs. REDACTED (See F/U Det. McIlvain for phone.) Mrs. REDACTED said she called Mrs. REDACTED and told her about the incident. Mrs. REDACTED advised Mrs. REDACTED to call the church and talk to the senior priest about it. I talked to the victim, REDACTED, a 7-year-old boy with blond hair and blue eyes. I first showed REDACTED my black flashlight and asked him what color it was. He said it was black. I asked him if I would be lying if I said the flashlight was yellow and he said yes. I asked if it was wrong to tell a lie and he said yes. I asked REDACTED if he would tell the truth and he said yes. Again, I stressed the importance of telling the truth.

REDACTED gave the following account: Today (1/26/81), his teacher, Mrs. REDACTED picked up REDACTED and drove him to CCD classes. The children play in the yard for awhile and then go to class. REDACTED put his books down on a bench away from the other kids; however, Father Roemer came out of his office and asked REDACTED to come inside and look at

1 some pictures. REDACTED went into the office and
2 Father Roemer sat in a chair near a desk. Father
3 Roemer lifted REDACTED up and placed REDACTED on the
4 Father's leg, far enough back so that REDACTED was
5 close to the Father's chest.

6 Father Roemer showed REDACTED a book with pictures
7 from when Father Roemer went to school. REDACTED
8 said it was the kind of book where everyone in the
9 class takes pictures together. I asked if he
10 meant a school yearbook and he said yes. While
11 looking at the book, Father Roemer put his hand
12 under REDACTED's T-shirt and started to rub REDACTED
13 stomach. I asked REDACTED to show me by rubbing his
14 own stomach. REDACTED made slow circular movements
15 on his stomach. REDACTED said that Father Roemer
16 rubbed REDACTED stomach for about one-half minute.
17 Father Roemer then slid his hand down into REDACTED
18 pants and inside REDACTED underpants. Father
19 Roemer started to rub REDACTED doofer. Father
20 Roemer rubbed REDACTED doofer for a couple of
21 minutes and then Father Roemer started shaking.
22 His hands and legs were shaking and Father Roemer
23 said, "I'm cold." REDACTED told me it was hot in the
24 room and that Father Roemer was wearing a jacket
25 or coat. REDACTED told me that he became scared and
26 asked Father Roemer if he could go now. Father
27 Roemer said, "Okay."

28 REDACTED went toward his class and on the way he told
his friend, REDACTED that Father Roemer had shown
him some pictures.

I asked REDACTED where his "doofer" was and he pointed
to his crotch area where his penis would be. I
asked REDACTED if he could tell me another name for
doofer, but he seemed too embarrassed. I asked
him if he used his doofer to go to the bathroom
and he said yes.

I put my pencil on the kitchen table and told
REDACTED to pretend that my pencil was REDACTED doofer
and to show me how Father Roemer rubbed REDACTED
doofer. REDACTED made several short, fast strokes
on the pencil.

I talked to Mrs. REDACTED again and she added that
Father Roemer was very friendly with children and
has taken several groups on field trips. Father
Roemer is the youth minister and active with all
the youth sports activities. Father Roemer was
not very involved in adult activities.

I contacted Det. K. McIlvain and told her the
above info. She called the church and left a
message for Father Roemer.

1 On 1/26/81 at about 2230 hours, Father Roemer
2 called the East Valley Sheriff's Station. I
3 called Det. REDACTED at Los Robles and she advised
4 to ask Father Roemer to come to the station. I
5 told Father Roemer we were investigating a case
6 and we would appreciate it if he could come down
7 right away. Father Roemer said he wasn't busy and
8 would come to the station. He didn't ask why.

9 REDACTED had told me that this had never happened
10 before and that he never saw anyone else go into
11 the office with Father Roemer before.

12 REDACTED said no one else witnessed the incident.

13 On January 26, 1981, Det. Kelli McIlvain of the East
14 Valley Station responded to the REDACTED residence for the
15 purpose of reinterviewing REDACTED Det. McIlvain
16 reported:

17 Following conversation with Deputy REDACTED, I
18 requested he have the victim and parents come to
19 the EVSO for interview. They arrived a few minutes
20 before 9 p.m.

21 Victim REDACTED 7-1/2 years, DOB:
22 REDACTED said that today while at St. Paschal's
23 Church, T.O., about 3:30 p.m., just prior to CCD
24 classes (religious instruction), suspect asked him
25 into a small office saying, "Do you want to see
26 some pictures." The victim sat on the priest's
27 lap as the priest showed him pictures from a book.
28 (Described like a school yearbook.) As the boy
looked at the book, the suspect put his hand
inside the victim's shirt and rubbed his abdomen
and chest area. Suspect then put his hand inside
victim's clothing and rubbed his doofer (penis).
The suspect began shaking very hard and said to
the victim, "It's cold in here." The victim
finally asked the suspect if he could leave and
the suspect said yes. After he got outside the
office, he told Mrs. REDACTED
that Father Roemer had shown him some pictures.
He then went to CCD class which starts at 3:45 p.m.
He told his parents what had occurred at dinner.
Victim also said the suspect kissed him on the
neck, near the right ear, as he was rubbing him.
The whole incident lasted about five minutes.

Mrs. REDACTED said she phoned REDACTED (CCD
teacher) after learning what occurred and Mrs.

1 REDACTED recalled REDACTED telling her that Father
2 Roemer had shown him pictures. REDACTED , after
3 hearing Mrs. REDACTED information, told her she
4 would contact REDACTED , an active church
5 member, to see what should be done about the
6 information. Mrs. REDACTED recontacted Mrs.
7 REDACTED saying REDACTED said the police should be
8 notified.

9 Mrs. REDACTED had already decided to phone the
10 police.

11 Prior to the interviews with the REDACTED I
12 phoned the church and left a message with Father
13 REDACTED to have Father Roemer phone me
14 as soon as possible.

15 The suspect returned the call around 2245 hours.
16 Deputy REDACTED talked with him and asked if he
17 could come to EVSO. He said he would.

18 STATEMENT OF DONALD PATRICK ROEMER

19 Detective McIlvain's report continues:

20 I interviewed suspect in the EVSO on tape,
21 following Miranda waiver, approximately 2300 hours.

22 Donald Patrick Roemer, DOB: 3-17-44, 36 years,
23 155 E. Janss Road, T.O. REDACTED
24 Following is a narrative summary of taped
25 interview.

26 The suspect, who has been a Catholic priest for 11
27 years, said that everything that REDACTED
28 said was probably true. Today, 1-26-81 around
3:30 p.m., he asked the boy into the teachers'
lounge on churchgrounds, had him sit on his lap,
stroked his stomach, abdomen, and genitals. He
also had the boy stand up next to him for awhile
and stroked his penis. As the boy was sitting on
his lap, he did begin to shake. He did make a
remark about it being cold to cover up for the
shaking. The suspect did have an erection and an
ejaculation resultant from the fondling. The
victim asked if he could go out to play and Father
Roemer said yes. The total time suspect was
stroking victim was about two minutes. When asked
if he kissed the victim, he said he didn't recall,
but if the victim said he kissed him, then he did.
The suspect said he knew when the boy left the
office that he would be found out. He also heard
the victim yell to Mrs. REDACTED that Father
Roemer had just shown him pictures.

1 Suspect said he has been struggling with feelings
2 of a homosexual nature since he was young and
3 sought assistance while assigned to a parish in
4 Santa Barbara through a church psychologist.

5 The suspect also admitted that information given
6 by REDACTED was true and did occur on 1-18-81.
7 (See statements of REDACTED under Count II.)

8 Also on 1-19-81, while in the teachers' lounge at
9 3:30 p.m., he rubbed the stomach, chest, and
10 underarm area of REDACTED 6th grade, 11 years.
11 (See statements of REDACTED under Count III.)

12 Two weeks ago, 1-12-81, teachers' lounge, he rubbed
13 stomach, chest of REDACTED 7-1/2 years.
14 (See statements of REDACTED under
15 Count IV.)

16 Father Roemer took a group of boys on a trip to
17 San Diego during the week following Christmas,
18 1980. They stayed in one hotel room with two
19 double beds. During this trip, at night, believing
20 REDACTED 14 years, to be asleep next to him in the
21 bed, he touched his genitals.

22 Also during this trip, while sleeping with REDACTED
23 REDACTED, 14 years, he attempted to touch his
24 genitals, but the boy had not been asleep. He got
25 out of the bed and went and laid down on the
26 floor. The suspect asked him what was wrong and
27 the boy replied, "You felt too low." The suspect
28 then told the boy he would never do anything like
that (to cover up his actions) and that the boy
was wrong about his intentions. (See statements
of REDACTED under Count VII.)

19 The suspect also related that he had use of a
20 ranch in Fillmore, via relatives, from approximately
21 August 1979 to August 1980 where he often took
22 boys for the weekend or overnight. They would
23 sleep in sleeping bags on the living room floor.
24 REDACTED 13 years, and REDACTED
25 14 years, on separate occasions (one time each)
26 were stroked on stomach and chest area. (See
27 statements of REDACTED pages 28 to 30,
28 and REDACTED pages 31 to 32.)

25 He stroked genitals and stomach of REDACTED
26 14 years, while asleep at the ranch on one, maybe
27 two occasions. (See statement of REDACTED
28 page 30.)

27 He also stroked stomach, chest area of REDACTED
28 REDACTED two or three times in the teachers' lounge

1 on churchgrounds.

2 The suspect was very cooperative, appeared truthful.
3 He said he usually had an erection during the
4 stroking activity and sometimes he ejaculated.

5 Suspect placed under arrest and booked EVSO.
6 Attached are photos of children in his wallet.
7 Red arrow is photo of REDACTED victim #2.

8 In a report prepared by Detective McIlvain on January 29,
9 1981, she stated:

10 On January 29, 1981, approximately 1615 hours, at
11 the direction of Deputy District Attorney REDACTED
12 REDACTED and while my conversation of 1/26/81 with
13 suspect Donald Patrick Roemer was still fresh in
14 my mind, I listened to the taped recording of that
15 conversation. The following is my word-for-word
16 accounting of the conversation from its beginning
17 through the Miranda waiver. All responses of
18 suspect are underlined. My statement/questions
19 are in quotes.

20 "I don't know if you are aware of the fact that
21 there is a family in Thousand Oaks that has a
22 young boy that is giving information accusing you
23 of child molest. The information was given this
24 evening and I felt like we should try to get in
25 touch with you as soon as we possibly could because
26 of the sensitivity of it. What is your whole
27 name, Father?"

28 Donald Patrick Roemer.

"And your date of birth?"

March 17, '44.

"Making you"

36.

"And your residence address?"

REDACTED

"Do you have your own phone there?"

25 Yes. Well, there's a house phone and I have a
26 private phone. The house phone is REDACTED

27 "The house phone is kind of like a work phone
28 isn't it?"

REDACTED

1 It's a work phone and I have a private line.
2 REDACTED

3 "I'd like to talk to you about the information
4 given, but I have to read you your rights because
5 at this point you are a suspect in the crime of
6 child molest. Okay."

7 Yes (suspect nods yes)

8 "You understand that you're suspected of committing
9 the crime of child molest? Do you understand?"

10 (Suspect nods head) Inaudible yes.

11 "You have the right to remain silent. Do you
12 understand?"

13 UmmHmm.

14 "If you give up that right, anything you say can
15 and will be used against you in a court of law.
16 Do you understand?"

17 (Suspect nods yes) Inaudible yes.

18 "You have the right to talk to a lawyer and have
19 him present with you before and while being questioned.
20 Do you understand?"

21 (Suspect nods head) Inaudible yes.

22 "If you cannot afford to hire a lawyer, one will
23 be appointed to represent you before any questioning
24 at no cost to you, if you wish one. Do you understand?"

25 (Suspect nods yes) Inaudible yes.

26 "Do you understand all of these rights (cough/
27 excuse me) that I have explained to you?"

28 (Suspect nods yes) Inaudible yes.

 "Do you have any questions about these rights?"

No, I don't think so.

 "Having these rights in mind, do you wish to give
 up these rights and talk to me about the charge
 against you?"

I'd rather talk to you.

 "You would?"

1 Yes.

2 "Okay."

3 "Do you know a boy by the name of REDACTED ,"

4 The interview was approximately 60 minutes long,
5 only the first 30 minutes were recorded on tape.
6 On the tape, suspect discussed activity with both
7 REDACTED boys, victim REDACTED and REDACTED. Off
8 tape, but during second part of interview, he
9 discussed victims REDACTED and REDACTED in San Diego,
10 REDACTED and REDACTED in Fillmore.

11 A verbatim transcript of the 30-minute taped portion of
12 the interview by Detective Kelli McIlvain of Donald Patrick
13 Roemer on January 26, 1981 is marked Exhibit "A," attached, and
14 fully incorporated herein by reference in this "Statement of
15 Facts."

16 On February 4, 1981, District Attorney Investigator
17 Pete Smart interviewed REDACTED and reported:

18 On February 4, 1981 at approximately 5 p.m.,
19 I interviewed REDACTED in the company of both
20 parents at his residence. Deputy District
21 Attorney REDACTED was present and participated
22 in the interview.

23 REDACTED is a 7-year-old, 2nd grade student at
24 University Elementary School in Thousand Oaks.
25 He attends CCD classes at St. Paschal's Church
26 and has done so for three years. His CCD
27 teacher is REDACTED who also transports
28 him to and from class.

29 REDACTED related the following information: I see
30 Father Roemer every time I go to CCD classes.
31 He always hugs me and kisses me on the head.
32 On January 26, 1981, when I got to CCD class,
33 Father Roemer came up and hugged me. He had a
34 book in his hand and said, "Come into the room
35 where the teachers meet (teachers' lounge) and
36 look at some pictures."

37 When we got in there, he picked me up and put
38 me on his lap. He was holding the book and
39 rubbing my "wiener." He told me to stand up
40 because it would be easier. He started shaking
41 after he started rubbing my "wiener." I asked

1 him why he was shaking and he said because he
2 was cold. He still had his hand under my pants
and I asked him if I could go outside. He
3 said, "Sure" and took his hand out of my pants.

4 I went outside and told Mrs. REDACTED that
5 Father Roemer had shown me some pictures and
6 tickled my chest.

7 When I got home and was eating dinner, I told my
8 Mom and Dad what had happened. I felt like a
"tattletale" for telling them.

9 I have never seen Father Roemer shake like that
10 before. When he was rubbing my "wiener," I
11 didn't tell him to stop because I was afraid.

12 On February 12, 1981, District Attorney Investigator
13 Pete Smart interviewed REDACTED by telephone.

14 Investigator Smart reported:

15 On February 12, 1981 at approximately 8 a.m.,
16 I telephoned the above witness regarding an
17 incident that occurred on January 26, 1981
involving Father Roemer and REDACTED

18 Mrs. REDACTED is a teacher at St. Paschal's
19 Church in Thousand Oaks. She transports
20 several children to and from CCD classes,
21 including REDACTED and REDACTED and REDACTED
22 REDACTED

23 Mrs. REDACTED related the following information:

24 On January 26, 1981, I drove REDACTED
25 REDACTED to CCD classes at St. Paschal's Church.
26 When we arrived, the boys got out of the car
27 and walked toward their classrooms. I went to
28 my classroom and then went to the supply room
to get some supplies for my class.

As I was returning from the supply room, en route
to my classroom, REDACTED came up to me and told me
that Father Roemer had taken him into his office
and had shown him some pictures. I made some
appropriate comment, like, "That's nice," or
something like that.

At that moment, Father Roemer walked up and asked
me what REDACTED had told me. Father Roemer asked if
REDACTED had told me that he had shown him some
pictures. The discussion was brief as it was time

1 for classes to start and REDACTED and I left for our
 2 classroom. I did not notice anything unusual
 3 about REDACTED that day, but I do recall he may have
 4 been nervous during class. He had to leave the
 5 classroom twice that day to go to the bathroom,
 6 which is unusual for REDACTED

7 In retrospect, I guess it was unusual for Father
 8 Roemer to walk up to me and ask what REDACTED had
 9 said to me. Father Roemer usually does not walk
 10 up to adults and talk to them. He spends the
 11 majority of his time with kids.

12 I know REDACTED quite well and I know in my heart he
 13 would not fabricate a story or lie about what has
 14 happened.

15 I have been very concerned about the entire
 16 incident because of the impact it has had on the
 17 community, the church, the young boys involved,
 18 and Father Roemer. I have a young son who is
 19 involved in the church and also attends CCD
 20 classes. I have questioned him about Father
 21 Roemer and he has denied that anything like that
 22 has happened or has been attempted. I feel confident
 23 he is being truthful.

24 COUNT II: REDACTED

25 On January 26, 1981, VSO Deputy REDACTED
 26 interviewed REDACTED (REDACTED brother), 10 years,
 27 DOB: REDACTED and reported:

28 He related that on 1/19/81, while suspect was
 hearing his confession, the suspect rubbed
 his stomach, chest, and underarm area (touching
 skin under his shirt). The suspect and REDACTED
 were sitting side-by-side in chairs. The
 suspect also kissed him on the right ear twice.

29 On February 4, 1981, District Attorney Investigator REDACTED
 30 REDACTED interviewed REDACTED and reported:

31 On February 4, 1981 at approximately 5:50 p.m.,
 32 I interviewed REDACTED in the company of both parents
 33 at his residence. Deputy District Attorney REDACTED
 34 REDACTED was present and participated in the
 35 interview.

36 /////

6523

1 REDACTED is 10 years old and is a 5th grade
 2 student at University Elementary School in
 3 Thousand Oaks. He is Catholic and attends
 4 St. Paschal's Church. He also attends CCD
 classes at the church on each Monday afternoon
 and is transported to and from the class by
 Mrs. REDACTED

5 REDACTED related the following information:

6 On January 19, 1981, my entire CCD class went
 7 to confession. The confession was with Father
 8 Roemer who instructed me to sit on a bench in
 9 the confessional. Father Roemer sat beside me.
 10 He hugged me and kissed my right ear two times.
 At the same time, he put his hand under my
 shirt and started rubbing my stomach, chest
 and under my arm. He continued rubbing for
 30-45 seconds and then stopped.

11 I finished with confession and left. I did not
 12 tell anyone what Father Roemer had done until
 13 REDACTED told my parents what had happened to him.
 Father Roemer has not done any thing like that
 to me before.

14
 15 COUNT III: REDACTED

16 On January 27, 1981, Sergeant Jack Hughes interviewed
 17 REDACTED 12 years, DOB REDACTED REDACTED
 18 Drive, REDACTED, REDACTED Sergeant REDACTED reported:

19 REDACTED interviewed 1/27/81. REDACTED
 20 told me he attends catechism classes at St.
 21 Paschal's Church every Monday from 1600 hours to
 22 1700 hours. He first denied going into a teachers'
 23 lounge, but then stated he did after his mother
 24 described the room. This interview was recorded
 25 and REDACTED mother and father was present. He said
 26 that Father Roemer talked to him about how he was
 27 doing in school. He denied sitting on Father
 28 Roemer's lap. He told me he was afraid of getting
 Father Roemer in trouble. He did say that some-
 times he (Father Roemer) put his hands under his
 (REDACTED) shirt. Father Roemer scratching under
 his arm. REDACTED denies that Father Roemer scratched
 or rubbed his chest. He did say that he rubbed
 his stomach once. He didn't remember when. REDACTED
 then said he didn't want to talk about it anymore.
 His mother inquired as to why and he replied he
 just didn't want to talk about it.

1 His parents told me they would call me if REDACTED told
2 them anymore. REDACTED father if REDACTED

3 On February 4, 1981, District Attorney Investigator
4 Pete Smart interviewed REDACTED Investigator Smart
5 reported:

6 On February 4, 1981 at approximately 3:30 p.m., I
7 interviewed REDACTED in the presence of his mother
8 at his residence in Thousand Oaks. Deputy District
9 Attorney REDACTED was present and participated
10 in the interview.

11 REDACTED is 12 years old. He is a 6th grade student
12 at Acacia Elementary School in Thousand Oaks. He
13 is Catholic and attends St. Paschal's Church and
14 CCD classes in Thousand Oaks. He has been a
15 member of St. Paschal's Church for approximately
16 five years. Through his association with the
17 church, he is acquainted with the defendant,
18 Father Roemer.

19 REDACTED related the following information:

20 On January 5, 1981, while attending CCD classes on
21 the churchgrounds, I was talking to Father Roemer
22 about my new school. I was telling him that
23 nobody there liked me and that was bothering me.
24 Father Roemer said he knew that and asked me to go
25 into the teachers' lounge with him to talk about
26 it.

27 We went into the teachers' lounge and sat down on
28 individual chairs. They were placed one behind
the other. I sat down and Father Roemer sat
directly behind me. We were talking about my new
school. Father Roemer started rubbing my stomach
and chest, under my shirt. He started shaking
while he was rubbing me. He continued rubbing my
stomach and chest for approximately five minutes.
(At this point I asked him to estimate when five
minutes had lapsed. We continued talking and Tim
interrupted to tell me that five minutes had
passed. The actual time that had lapsed was five
minutes and six seconds, as timed by REDACTED
stopwatch.

29 The next incident occurred the following week
30 (January 12, 1981) at CCD classes. Father Roemer
31 took me into the nurse's office. I thought he
32 wanted to talk to me about my new school. I sat
33 on a couch and Father Roemer sat behind me. He

1 started rubbing my chest and under my arms. His
 2 hand was under my shirt while he was rubbing.
 3 This lasted for about three minutes and Father
 4 Roemer was shaking while he rubbed me. We did not
 5 say anything about the rubbing, but I was a little
 6 concerned about it.

7 On the following week (January 19, 1981) at CCD
 8 class, Father Roemer took me into the teachers'
 9 lounge to talk to me about my new school.

10 We sat in individual chairs again. Father Roemer
 11 sat behind me and put his hand under my shirt.
 12 He started rubbing my chest and under my arms.
 13 He was shaking, like he was nervous, while he
 14 rubbed me. This time it lasted about eight
 15 minutes. We talked about my new school and I
 16 looked at a magazine while Father Roemer was
 17 rubbing me. About two minutes after he stopped
 18 rubbing, the bell rang and I went to class.

19 This is the last time anything happened. I did
 20 not see Father Roemer when I first went to class
 21 the next week (January 26, 1981). (REDACTED
 22 incident occurred on this date.)

23 COUNT IV: REDACTED

24 On January 27, 1981, Sergeant Jack Hughes interviewed

25 REDACTED 8 years, REDACTED Thousand Oaks,

26 REDACTED Sergeant Hughes reported:

27 REDACTED interview, 1/27/81.

28 I talked with Ronald with his father, REDACTED
 REDACTED present. The interview was
 recorded. REDACTED told me he attends catechism
 classes at St. Paschal's Church. He attends
 class only on Mondays. He missed the class on
 Jan. 19, 81, but was there on Jan. 12, 81. His
 father confirmed these dates as REDACTED was not
 sure of the dates. He told me sometimes he
 sits on Father Roemer's lap and they talk about
 football. He plays football for the Raiders.
 REDACTED did not remember when he went to the
 teachers' lounge with Father Roemer, maybe two
 or three weeks ago. He said his father dropped
 him off and he went to the lounge with Father
 Roemer. They left the lounge prior to the class
 bell ringing. He said he did not go in with
 his shirt off. REDACTED said that in the lounge,
 Father Roemer rubbed his chest and stomach. I
 asked REDACTED to show me how Father Roemer rubbed
 his chest. REDACTED pulled up his shirt and put

1 his hand under the shirt. He rubbed his
2 breast and stomach. I asked him what that part
3 of his body was called and he told me, "boobies."
4 He then said that Father Roemer rubbed his
5 boobies. He said Father Roemer never put his
6 hand inside his pants and Father Roemer never
7 asked him to touch any part of Father Roemer's
8 body. He said that Father Roemer only rubbed
9 his chest the one time in the room. REDACTED said
10 that Father Roemer shivered like he was cold
11 while rubbing him. Nobody was in the room when
12 this occurred. He did not tell anyone what had
13 happened and no one has told him it happened to
14 them also. I asked REDACTED how long the Father
15 rubbed him and he told me five minutes. I then
16 asked REDACTED to tell me about how long, to tell
17 me when to stop timing him, when it had been as
18 long as with the Father. REDACTED stopped me
19 around 40 seconds after I started timing him.
20 He told me he did not tell Father Roemer to stop.
21 I asked REDACTED if he knew what a lie was and he
22 told me it is when you don't tell the truth.

23 On February 4, 1981 at approximately 1:10 p.m., District
24 Attorney Investigator Pete Smart interviewed REDACTED
25 Investigator Smart reported:

26 On February 4, 1981 at approximately 1:10 p.m.,
27 I interviewed REDACTED in the presence of his
28 father at his residence. Deputy District
Attorney REDACTED was also present and
participated in the interview.

REDACTED is 8 years old and is a 2nd grade student
at La Dera Elementary School in Thousand Oaks.
He is Catholic and attends St. Paschal's Church
and CCD classes. He is acquainted with Father
Roemer through his association with the church.

REDACTED related the following information:

My Dad usually takes me to CCD classes and
drops me off. When I get there, I just walk
around, usually by myself until class starts.
I always see Father Roemer there. One day,
Father Roemer walked up to me and said, "Hi."
We started talking about football. Father Roemer
said he had won trophies and asked me if I wanted
to see them. We went into the teachers' lounge
and he closed the door. Father Roemer asked me to
sit down on the couch and he sat down beside me,
about six inches away from me.

1 We were talking about football and he showed me a
2 medal he won in football. He stuck his hand under
3 my shirt and started rubbing my stomach and chest,
including my nipples. He asked me if it felt good
and I said, "Kinda."

4 Father Roemer had his hand on my leg while he was
5 rubbing my stomach. He was shivering while rubbing
6 my chest and stomach. He started shivering soon
7 after he started rubbing my stomach. When his
8 hand was on my leg, it was close to my privates,
9 but he did not touch them. After Father Roemer
10 stopped shivering, he told me I had better go out
11 now because classes were about to start.

12 I asked REDACTED if Father Roemer had ever done this
13 to him before. He said that he had about seven
14 times before, always outside on the churchgrounds
15 while he was waiting for CCD classes to start.
16 REDACTED said it only happened the one time in the
17 teachers' lounge and that was the only time he was
18 aware that Father Roemer shivered.

19 REDACTED said that he felt that it was "weird or
20 strange" that Father Roemer rubbed his stomach and
21 he felt uncomfortable and thought it was wrong.

22 COUNT V: REDACTED

23 On January 28, 1981 at approximately 11 a.m., Detective
24 Kelli McIlvain received a telephone call from Mrs. REDACTED
25 regarding her son, REDACTED. Detective McIlvain reported:

26 Approximately 1100 hours, 1/28/81, I received a
27 phone call from Mrs. REDACTED. She related that
28 she had taken her son, REDACTED 11 years, to
see suspect for some counseling around the middle
of November 1980. The suspect arranged to take
him to a drive-in movie the Saturday night after
Thanksgiving, 11/29/80. The suspect picked him up
about 8:30 p.m. and returned him early, around 10
p.m. When REDACTED got home, he said he was tired
and went right to bed. Either that same evening
or the following day, she received a phone call
from suspect. He said he just wanted to know how
REDACTED was doing. Mrs. REDACTED thought suspect was
just concerned. Another counseling appointment
was made with suspect, but REDACTED refused to go to
it. Then last night, following press article of
suspect's arrest, REDACTED told her that while at the
drive-in the suspect had touched his leg and he
REDACTED moved to the far side of the car and kept

1 his coat pulled tightly around himself. After a
 2 while, he told the suspect he was tired and wanted
 3 to go home, to get away from the suspect. Mrs.
 4 REDACTED said she had talked with her son's pedia-
 5 trician and that REDACTED has some emotional problems
 6 stemming from abuse by his natural father and the
 7 pediatrician recommended, and she concurred, that
 8 REDACTED was not at a state where he should be inter-
 9 viewed. She went on to say she felt the whole
 10 thing should have been handled by the church. She
 11 knows the Roemer family and has felt physically
 12 ill ever since the news article came out. She was
 13 very upset on the phone, crying. She did say,
 14 near the end of the conversation, that she would
 15 talk to her husband and possibly consider an
 16 interview at a later date (Mrs. REDACTED husband
 17 had phoned me 1/27/81 and advised his stepson
 18 could possibly have some information regarding the
 19 case and he said his wife would bring him in for
 20 an interview at 1 p.m., 1/28/81).

21 The District Attorney's Office made repeated efforts to
 22 interview both Mrs. REDACTED and REDACTED, but permission
 23 was refused by Mrs. REDACTED. She stated that her son's
 24 emotional condition was too precarious to permit such interviews,
 25 and she had been advised by REDACTED pediatrician to avoid the
 26 trauma of testifying in court. Mrs. REDACTED refused to
 27 disclose the name of the doctor, and refused the offer of the
 28 District Attorney's Office to put her doctor in contact with
 Dr. REDACTED of the Harbor-UCLA Medical Center so that
 the pediatrician would have the benefit of expert advice and
 consultation in order to properly assess what the effects of
 testifying would be on REDACTED. Shortly before the scheduled
 preliminary hearing of March 3, 1981, Mrs. REDACTED retained
 Attorney REDACTED and directed the District Attorney's
 Office to deal with him.

//////

//////

1 COUNT VI: REDACTED

2 On January 28, 1981, Detective REDACTED interviewed
3 REDACTED, 12 years, DOB REDACTED REDACTED Thousand
4 Oaks, REDACTED, Detective REDACTED reported:

5 REDACTED, 12 years, DOB REDACTED
6 Thousand Oaks, REDACTED

7 Above witness interviewed on tape 1/28/81 at 1530
8 hours in presence of his mother, REDACTED

9 He said that during the summer 1980, he attended
10 REDACTED Sports Camp held at St. Paschal's
11 School. It was held from Monday through Friday
12 from about 8:30 a.m. to 1 p.m. He missed Monday's
13 session. On Tuesday, his first day at the camp,
14 the suspect stood close behind him, wrapped his
15 arms around his chest area, leaned his (suspect)
16 head down, chin resting on witness' head and was
17 talking to him. This made REDACTED nervous and
18 uncomfortable. For the rest of Tuesday he tried
19 to avoid suspect. When his Mom picked him up
20 Tuesday afternoon, he told her that he didn't want
21 to return to the camp and explained what suspect
22 had done. His Mom told him to avoid the suspect
23 and she would come to the field early to pick him
24 up every day and watch him. On Wednesday, witness
25 felt like the suspect was looking for him all day.
26 At one point, while witness was playing soccer,
27 suspect came up to him and said, "You can't get
28 away from me." On Thursday, while witness was
playing football, the suspect told the witness
that the witness was a pretty good runner and when
he (suspect) was in school, he was a good runner
too. He asked the witness to come to his office
sometime and look at his sports pictures in his
high school yearbook.

22 On February 4, 1981, District Attorney Investigator

23 REDACTED interviewed REDACTED Investigator REDACTED

24 reported:

25 On February 4, 1981 at approximately 9:30 a.m., I
26 interviewed REDACTED at the East Valley Sheriff's
27 Office in the presence of his mother, REDACTED
28 Deputy District Attorney REDACTED was present
during the interview. REDACTED is a 7th grade student
at Ascension Lutheran School in Thousand Oaks.

1 REDACTED was questioned regarding his involvement with
2 the defendant, Father Donald Patrick Roemer. He
3 related the following information: I attended the
4 REDACTED Sports Camp at St. Paschal's Church
5 in Thousand Oaks on June 16 through June 21, 1980.
6 Father Roemer was present each day that I attended.
7 I was acquainted with Father Roemer, having first
8 met him while playing flag football in October
9 1979, but had no previous personal contact with
10 him.

11 On June 17, 1980, while at the sports camp, Father
12 Roemer came over to a bench where I was sitting
13 with three or four other boys. He said, "Hi,
14 how's it going?" and sat down between me and
15 another boy. He put his arm around my shoulder
16 and started asking questions. He asked me what my
17 name was, how old I was, what my favorite sport
18 was, and other similar questions. While he was
19 sitting there, his body was in contact with mine
20 and on at least two occasions, he placed his head
21 next to mine. His face would be very close to
22 mine when his head was leaning on my shoulder and
23 he would turn to talk to me.

24 Father Roemer said I was a nice boy and that I
25 could run very fast. At that point I got up and
26 went out to play basketball. While playing ball,
27 I saw Father Roemer put his head on the shoulder
28 of some other boys that were sitting on the bench.
I didn't see Father Roemer anymore that day.

When my Mom picked me up that day, I told her I
didn't want to go back because the priest was
doing weird things. After I told her about what
Father Roemer was doing, we stayed there for
awhile and watched him.

20 Mrs. REDACTED interjected that she watched
21 Father Roemer go from child to child, hugging,
22 touching, and kissing them. She saw him rubbing
23 their faces, heads and upper bodies. The kids
24 appeared to try to get away from him, but he would
25 resist their attempts. Mrs. REDACTED stated her
26 observations made her very concerned about Father
27 Roemer's conduct and felt he was overly friendly.

28 REDACTED, continued: I returned to the sports camp on
June 18, but did not see Father Roemer on that
day. On June 19, at about 11:30 a.m., I was
getting ready to play soccer. I saw Father Roemer
and tried to avoid him. He pursued me and said,
"You can't get away from me." He came up behind
me and wrapped his arms around me and put his chin
on my shoulder. I started to walk away from him

1 and he walked with me, still holding that position.
 2 He was talking to REDACTED and I pulled away
 3 from him. I was under the impression that Father
 4 Roemer's behavior was similar to that of a homosexual.

5 When the activities were over for that day, I went
 6 to the front of the church and waited for my ride.
 7 I was sitting on a bench when Father Roemer came
 8 up and sat very close to me. His body was touching
 9 mine and he put his arm around my shoulder. He
 10 kept his arm around me until some other boys came
 11 up and started talking to him. The kids and
 12 Father Roemer left and I was picked up shortly
 13 thereafter.

14 On June 20, 1981, I returned to the sports camp
 15 and ran the 50-yard dash. Father Roemer came up
 16 and said, "You run very fast." He said that he
 17 was a runner in high school and said, "Someday you
 18 can come over and look at my annual." I said,
 19 "yeah, sure," in a low voice, expressing reluctance.
 20 Father Roemer said, "See you later," and walked
 21 away. I think he knew I was reluctant.

22 In October 1980, I saw Father Roemer when I was
 23 signing up for flag football at Thousand Oaks High
 24 School. I hid from him, not wanting him to see me
 25 because I was afraid of him.

26 I saw him one time after that in January 1981 at
 27 the Westlake Theatre. He was there with a young
 28 boy and did not see me. I have not seen him since
 29 that time.

30 COUNT VII: REDACTED

31 On January 27, 1981, Detective Kelli McIlvain interviewed
 32 REDACTED 14 years, DOB: REDACTED
 33 REDACTED REDACTED, REDACTED

34 Detective McIlvain reported:

35 Above victim interviewed on tape in presence of
 36 his father, REDACTED approximately 1930
 37 hours.

38 He related that he, REDACTED and REDACTED
 39 went to San Diego with suspect from December 26,
 40 1980 to December 30, 1980, from Friday to the
 41 following Tuesday. They stayed in a Holiday Inn
 42 in a room with two double beds. The evening of
 43 December 26, 1980, REDACTED slept in one bed with
 44 suspect. The next three nights, December 27, 28,

1 29, 1980, REDACTED slept in the bed with suspect.
 2 On Saturday night, December 27, 1980, REDACTED
 3 recalls the suspect and boys laid in bed (actually
 4 REDACTED slept on the floor the whole four
 5 nights) and talked until about 0100 (December 28,
 6 1980). This was the first time REDACTED slept with
 7 suspect. As they were all talking, suspect was
 8 rubbing his chest, underarm and stomach area.
 9 About 1 a.m., they quit talking and decided to go
 10 to sleep. The suspect was still rubbing and as he
 11 began rubbing REDACTED lower stomach area, REDACTED
 12 got up out of the bed and went and laid down on
 13 the floor. The suspect got out of bed and sat on
 14 the floor next to REDACTED. Suspect asked him what
 15 was wrong. REDACTED said, "You rubbed too low."
 16 The suspect told him that he had been asleep/half
 17 asleep and he would never do anything to hurt him.
 18 That it was not his purpose or intention to do
 19 anything besides stroke his stomach. The victim,
 20 REDACTED, says he believes the suspect. The suspect
 21 didn't touch him the next two nights. REDACTED said
 22 that what occurred is really nothing and he doesn't
 23 want to get the suspect in any trouble.

13 On February 4, 1981, District Attorney Investigator
 14 Pete Smart interviewed REDACTED Investigator Smart
 15 reported:

16 On February 4, 1981, I interviewed REDACTED
 17 in the presence of his mother at the REDACTED residence.
 18 Deputy District Attorney REDACTED was present
 19 and participated in the interview.

18 REDACTED is a 9th grade student at Thousand Oaks
 19 High School. He is Catholic and attends church
 20 and CCD classes at St. Paschal's Church in Thousand
 21 Oaks. He is acquainted with Father Roemer, having
 22 been introduced to him by REDACTED at McDonald's
 23 Restaurant approximately three years ago. He has
 24 socialized with Father Roemer on several occasions.
 25 He has gone to movies with Father Roemer and on
 26 one occasion, went on an overnight trip to San
 27 Diego with him.

24 While attending the movie, Father Roemer would put
 25 his arm around him and would rub his bare back.
 26 REDACTED said he thought that was okay and didn't
 27 see anything wrong with Father Roemer rubbing his
 28 back.

27 Regarding the trip to San Diego, REDACTED related
 28 the following information:

1 Father Roemer called and asked me if I wanted to
2 go to San Diego. I told him that I would like to
go.

3 On December 26, 1980, Father Roemer, REDACTED
4 REDACTED, and I went to San Diego. We
5 stayed in a single room with two double beds at
6 the Holiday Inn in downtown San Diego. Father
7 Roemer paid for the room, our meals, and most of
8 the expenses while we were there.

9 The first night we were there, I slept in one of
10 the beds alone. Father Roemer and REDACTED slept in
11 the other bed and REDACTED slept on the floor. The
12 next night, I slept in bed with Father Roemer. I
13 slept in my boxer shorts and Father Roemer wore
pajamas.

14 Father Roemer started rubbing my back. He also
15 rubbed my stomach and chest. He was not saying
16 anything about what he was doing. I was uncom-
17 forttable and got out of bed. Father Roemer got
18 out of bed and asked me what was wrong. I told
19 him I was uncomfortable and that he had "rubbed a
20 little too low."

21 Father Roemer said he was half asleep and didn't
22 know what was going on. He apologized and said he
23 was sorry if he had annoyed me.

24 COUNT VIII: REDACTED

25 On December 27, 1980, Deputy Joseph Cipollini of the
26 Ventura County Sheriff's Department interviewed REDACTED
27 REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED Deputy
28 REDACTED reported:

29 I responded to REDACTED Newbury Park,
30 where I contacted victim REDACTED, a 6-year-
31 old boy. I asked REDACTED to tell me what happened
32 in his own words.

33 REDACTED said that, "Awhile" ago, he and his family
34 went camping with a church group. One night they
35 were there, he asked suspect (he calls him Father
36 Pat) to come over to his bed to say his goodnight
37 prayers. After saying the prayers, suspect reached
38 down his pajama bottoms and began feeling his
"penis." He said he did it for about the time it
takes to count to 20. During the time the suspect
talked about "peace." REDACTED did not say or do
anything during this time.

1 I asked REDACTED why he waited to tell what happened.
2 He said that he was afraid that he (victim) would
3 be sent to jail. He also said that suspect has
4 never done anything like this to him before, nor
5 has he since. Suspect has not talked to victim
6 about what happened. REDACTED said he had felt bad
7 since it occurred, so he finally told his mother.
8 REDACTED said he could not give any further details.

9 I talked to REDACTED mother. She
10 relayed the following:

11 On May 10 and 11, 1980, she and her family went on
12 a religious retreat at Camp Yolijsa in the San
13 Bernardino Mountains. They went with Father
14 Patrick Roemer and other members of St. Paschal's
15 congregation, Thousand Oaks. She said that after
16 they returned, REDACTED no longer wanted to go to
17 church. He seemed to have a dramatic change in
18 attitude toward church.

19 She said that REDACTED told her about the incident on
20 December 25, 1980. She waited to report it because
21 they were out of town. She said their family is
22 very close to Father Roemer and she reported it in
23 hopes he would receive help.

24 On January 28, 1981, Detective Tom Odle of the Ventura
25 County Sheriff's Department reported an interview with REDACTED
26 REDACTED

27 At the request of Lt. REDACTED, I interviewed
28 above victim at his home at REDACTED in
29 Newbury Park. The victim stated that he and his
30 father had gone to a weekend retreat with Father
31 Roemer from St. Paschal's Church. The victim, nor
32 his father, could remember exactly when the trip
33 took place, possibly in late April or May of 1980.
34 The victim stated he was in his pajamas at approx-
35 imately 2000 hours when Father Roemer started
36 talking to him about the church and God. During
37 the conversation, Father Roemer touched the victim
38 in the groin area. According to victim, Father
39 Roemer then removed his hand and nothing more
40 happened. The victim's father was asleep in
41 another bunk in the room at the time it happened.

42 I asked victim's mother if she desired criminal
43 proceedings and she stated she was only interested
44 in seeing that Father Roemer received help for his
45 problem.

1 The above information was relayed to Lt. McKinley.

2 On January 5, 1981, Lt. Braden McKinley of the Ventura
3 County Sheriff's Office filed the following report regarding
4 action taken by him in the matter involving REDACTED

5 Lt. McKinley reported:

6 On Monday, 29 December 80, Lt. REDACTED telephoned
7 me and advised me of information contained in
8 original report. On Tuesday, 30 December 80, I
9 contacted Father REDACTED Sacred Heart
10 Church, for advice on how to best handle the
11 situation, administratively.

12 On Friday, 2 January 81, I telephoned Mrs. REDACTED
13 mother of victim and arranged for Det. REDACTED to
14 further interview victim on that date.

15 Mrs. REDACTED told me that she and her son had
16 spoken to Father REDACTED Father Roemer's superior,
17 and informed him of the incident, who assured them
18 the incident would be thoroughly handled. Det.
19 REDACTED evaluation of the victim was that he was
20 probably truthful about the incident.

21 As the incident occurred more than seven months
22 ago in another jurisdiction (San Berdo) and a copy
23 of the report had been sent to SBSO for statistical
24 purposes and victim and parents desire no formal
25 prosecution and they have brought the incident to
26 the superior of suspect, presumably competent
27 authority, no further action is warranted by this
28 department. Case closed.

On February 4, 1981, District Attorney Investigator

Pete Smart interviewed Mrs. REDACTED and her son,

REDACTED, Investigator REDACTED reported:

On February 4, 1981 at approximately 11 a.m., I
interviewed REDACTED and her son, REDACTED
at the Ventura County Sheriff's East Valley Station.
Deputy District Attorney REDACTED was present
during the interview.

REDACTED is a 7-year-old male. He is a 2nd grade
student at Bannon Elementary School in Newbury
Park.

/////

1 Mrs. REDACTED related the following information:

2 I first met Father Roemer about three years ago at
3 a CCD teachers' class at St. Paschal's Church in
4 Thousand Oaks. At that time, I was attending a
5 Catholic church in Newbury Park. About a year
6 later I started attending St. Paschal's Church
7 because of Father Roemer. He was very friendly,
8 maybe even overly friendly, but I liked him very
9 much.

10 On May 10 and 11, 1980, our family attended a
11 family retreat in San Bernardino. We stayed in
12 barrack-type houses. The men occupied one and the
13 women were housed in the other. Sleeping facilities
14 consisted of bunk-type beds, similar to military
15 style. We stayed at the camp for two days and
16 then returned home.

17 I was not aware of any unusual appearance or
18 incident while attending the retreat. However, on
19 December 27, 1980, REDACTED related an incident
20 involving Father Roemer that occurred at the
21 retreat. REDACTED said that Father Roemer had rubbed
22 his stomach and his genitals while he was in bed
23 and had called Father Roemer to help him say his
24 prayers.

25 The incident was reported to the Sheriff's Office.
26 I also reported the incident to Father O'Ryan who
27 is the pastor at St. Paschal's Church. Father
28 O'Ryan assured me the matter would be dealt with.
Therefore, we decided not to pursue criminal
prosecution. I have not received any feedback
from Father O'Ryan as to what action was taken
regarding this incident if, in fact, anything had
been done whatsoever.

REDACTED was then asked a series of questions regarding
the incident that occurred at this retreat. He
related the following information:

22 We got there (church camp) at about 9:30 or 10
23 p.m. We had a snack and then went to bed. We
24 were sleeping with our clothes on in sleeping bags
25 on bunk beds. My Dad was sleeping in a bunk
26 across from me on the other side of the room. The
27 lights were all turned off, except for the one in
28 the bathroom.

26 I called Father Roemer and asked him a question.
27 He came over and knelt down beside my bed. He was
28 still dressed at that time. I asked Father Roemer
a question. He started to answer the question and
at the same time stuck his hand under my pants.

1 He held onto my penis and moved his fingers. His
2 fingers were wrapped around my penis and he moved
3 the lower fingers while holding it. REDACTED demon-
4 strated with the use of a soda bottle that he had
5 been drinking from.) He held onto my penis for
6 about 60 seconds. He did not say anything about
7 it. I did not say anything about it because I was
8 "too scared to tell him to stop." He was patting
9 me on the head at the same time he was holding
10 my penis.

11 After about 60 seconds, Father Roemer said goodnight
12 and left. I saw him go into the bathroom. After
13 Father Roemer left, I laid there for about a
14 half hour because I could not go to sleep. "I had
15 nightmares about Father Roemer dying because he
16 did sin."

17 The next morning someone said that I fell out of
18 bed and Father Roemer picked me up and put me back
19 in bed. I do not remember anything about that.

20 I thought about what Father Roemer had done to me,
21 but I did not tell my Dad because I was too scared
22 ~~and I did not think anyone would believe me.~~

23 I saw Father Roemer that day, but only with my Mom
24 and Dad. Nothing else happened while we were at
25 the camp. I saw Father Roemer at church thereafter,
26 but he never did anything like that to me again.
27 He always hugged and kissed me, but that is all.

28 On February 6, 1981, District Attorney Investigator
Pete Smart talked with Mrs. REDACTED by telephone.
Investigator Smart reported:

On February 6, 1981 at approximately 1 p.m., I
telephoned Mrs. REDACTED regarding an incident
involving her son, REDACTED

Mrs. REDACTED stated she talked to Father REDACTED on
December 27, 1980 and again on January 30, 1981
regarding the Father Roemer incident involving her
son, REDACTED

Mrs. REDACTED stated that Father REDACTED, appeared to
be grateful that the matter had been brought to
his attention. He assured her that the situation
would be thoroughly looked into and something
would be done about it. He gave the analogy that
the situation "is like having a splinter in your
thumb, if something isn't done about it, it continues
to get worse."

1 Mrs. REDACTED stated that Father O'Ryan has never
2 discussed the matter with her since that time.
3 Therefore, she is not aware of any action taken by
4 Father O'Ryan, if, in fact, any had been taken.

5 On February 10, 1981, District Attorney Investigator
6 REDACTED telephoned Father Colm O'Ryan, Pastor of St.
7 Paschal's Church in Thousand Oaks. Investigator Smart
8 reported:

9 On February 10, 1981 at approximately 7:50 a.m., I
10 called Father O'Ryan regarding a scheduled appointment
11 for an interview that he had cancelled.

12 Father O'Ryan stated he had consulted with legal
13 counsel who had advised him not to discuss the
14 case involving Father Roemer with the District
15 Attorney. Therefore, he felt he should follow
16 that advice.

17 I asked Father O'Ryan if he had been advised by
18 defense attorney, REDACTED Father O'Ryan
19 said he had not. He stated he had been advised by
20 a local legal counsel in the community and refused
21 to identify that person.

22 I informed Father O'Ryan it was essential that we
23 talk with him regarding Father Roemer since he is
24 Father Roemer's supervisor and obviously knowledgeable
25 about the allegations involving Father Roemer. I
26 told Father O'Ryan he would receive a subpoena in
27 the near future. Therefore, he would be required
28 to appear as a witness, without the benefit of
discussing the facts of the case with the District
Attorney.

Father O'Ryan stated he would recontact his
legal advisor and let me know if and when he
would allow an interview.

23 /////

24 /////

25 /////

26 /////

27 /////

28 /////

6539

ADDITIONAL VICTIMS

A. REDACTED

On January 27, 1981, Detective McIlvain interviewed
REDACTED 14 years, DOB: REDACTED
Thousand Oaks, REDACTED

Detective REDACTED reported:

Above victim interviewed on tape. He was brought
in by parents, REDACTED and REDACTED approx-
imately 2010 hours, EVSO.

He said that the suspect never did anything to
him. A couple of times he went on overnight trips
with suspect to a ranch in Fillmore. On the first
trip, he was one of six boys taken by suspect. He
didn't really know the other five, but recalls one
boy's name was REDACTED. On the second trip, he was
one of five boys. His friend and neighbor, REDACTED
REDACTED Thousand Oaks, REDACTED
went also. He cannot remember who else went. (He
and his parents could not recall the dates.) They
all slept in sleeping bags on the floor in the
living room. The suspect had tickled his chest
and stomach area, but nothing else. After talking
with victim REDACTED I asked his parents if they
would check to see if they could identify dates of
Fillmore trips. One trip was during school year,
prior to summer 1980. Approximately 2100 hours, I
received a call from Mrs. REDACTED. She
advised that the REDACTED were mistaken. Her
son, REDACTED had never gone on any trip with suspect.
She also said she had talked with her son and the
suspect had never done anything to him. She
seemed upset.

On February 5, 1981, District Attorney Investigator
Pete Smart interviewed REDACTED. Investigator
Smart reported:

On February 5, 1981 at approximately 9:40 a.m., I
interviewed REDACTED in the presence of both of his
parents at the District Attorney's Office. Deputy
District Attorney REDACTED was present and
participated in the interview.

REDACTED is a 9th grade student at Newbury Park High
School. He is Catholic and attends St. Paschal's
Church and CCD classes. He has known Father

1 Roemer since he (Roemer) came to St. Paschal's
2 parish and is very fond of him. REDACTED is also
3 active in the St. Paschal's youth program. He has
4 socialized with Father Roemer on several occasions.
5 He has attended movies and has gone on overnight
6 outings with him to Father Roemer's parents' ranch
7 in Fillmore. He has never been alone with Father
8 Roemer on any of these social outings.

9 REDACTED thinks Father Roemer is a very affectionate
10 person. Father Roemer has hugged him and kissed
11 him on the forehead many times. REDACTED claims he
12 has never gone into the teachers' lounge with
13 Father Roemer. However, he has gone into his
14 office and has been shown pictures in a book.
15 While looking at the pictures, they were sitting
16 side-by-side and Father Roemer had his arm around
17 him.

18 On one occasion, REDACTED invited Father Roemer to
19 his home for a swimming party. This occurred in
20 early-August 1980. REDACTED REDACTED
21 and REDACTED REDACTED were also present. Mr. & Mrs.
22 REDACTED were not at home; however, were aware of
23 the party and gave their approval.

24 During the course of the party, Father Roemer
25 "tickled" REDACTED in the rib area. REDACTED denies
26 that Father Roemer had ever rubbed his stomach
27 and/or chest.

28 REDACTED has also gone to the movies and on overnight
outings to Father Roemer's ranch in Fillmore. At
the movie, Father Roemer would sit between REDACTED
and one of the other boys who were present. Father
Roemer would put his arm around him and occasionally
tickle his knee. He did not attempt to rub his
back or other parts of his body.

REDACTED and several boys were invited by Father
Roemer to spend the night at his parents' ranch in
Fillmore. They arrived at the ranch at approx-
imately 4:30 or 5 p.m. They went for a walk, ate,
and then sat around the living room telling ghost
stories. Father Roemer had his arm around someone
all of the time.

At approximately 10 or 11 p.m., they decided to
turn in for the night. They all slept in sleeping
bags on the floor, except Father Roemer. He slept
on the couch. Everyone slept in pajamas. They
changed into their pajamas in the bedroom, out of
the presence of Father Roemer and each other.

//////

1 REDACTED denied that Father Roemer had touched or
 2 rubbed him while they were at the ranch. He did
 3 not observe Father Roemer touching or rubbing any
 4 of the others present. There were no unusual or
 5 remarkable occurrences while at the ranch. The
 6 following morning they got up around 8 a.m. and
 7 returned home.

8 REDACTED said that Father Roemer is a very affectionate
 9 person and has hugged him, kissed him on the
 10 forehead and tickled him. However, he has not
 11 attempted to rub his stomach or chest. REDACTED
 12 said that Father REDACTED is also affectionate, but
 13 he doesn't tickle. REDACTED denies being aware of
 14 Father Roemer shaking or shivering during any of
 15 the aforementioned contacts with him.

16 B. REDACTED

17 Detective Kelli McIlvain of the Ventura County Sheriff's
 18 Department interviewed REDACTED 14 years, DOB:
 19 REDACTED Thousand Oaks, REDACTED Detective
 20 McIlvain reported:

21 Above victim interviewed in presence of his father,
 22 REDACTED in EVSO on tape.

23 He related the suspect had never done anything to
 24 him. He did go on an overnight trip to the ranch
 25 once. Neither he nor his father could recall the
 26 date. They did sleep in sleeping bags on the
 27 living room floor and the suspect slept next to
 28 him in a sleeping bag, but he could not recall
 suspect touching him.

29 C. REDACTED

30 On January 27, 1981, Sergeant Jack Hughes of the Ventura
 31 County Sheriff's Department interviewed REDACTED
 32 14 years, DOB: REDACTED REDACTED
 33 REDACTED Sergeant Hughes reported:

34 REDACTED interview 1/27/81, 1915 hours. I
 35 recorded the interview with REDACTED with his father
 36 and mother present.

37 /////

1 He told me he went to San Diego with Father
 2 Roemer the Friday after Christmas. They left on
 3 December 26, and stayed five days and four nights
 4 at the Holiday Inn in San Diego, Room 1003. He
 5 said two other boys went along, REDACTED
 6 (unknown last name). They stayed in a single room
 7 which had two double beds. The first night, the
 8 night of December 26, 1980, he slept with Father
 9 Roemer. REDACTED slept on the floor and REDACTED
 10 slept in the other bed alone. He only slept the
 11 one night in the same bed with Father Roemer. He
 12 said he did not know if anything had happened as
 13 far as Father Roemer touching him anywhere. He
 14 is a sound sleeper, which his mother confirmed.
 15 His mother said that REDACTED is very hard to wake up.
 16 There was no reason he did not sleep in the same
 17 bed as Father Roemer. He just fell asleep on the
 18 floor watching TV. He told me he is fond of
 19 Father Roemer, but would tell me if he remembered
 20 anything happening.

21 D. REDACTED

22 Deputy William Montijo of the Ventura Sheriff's Department,
 23 on February 12, 1981, attempted to interview REDACTED
 24 and made the following report:

25 At approx. 1930 hours, I drove to REDACTED
 26 Drive, T. Oaks, in an effort to interview
 27 REDACTED a victim in this investigation.
 28 REDACTED, victim's step-father, met me
 outside of the house and I explained my purpose.
 REDACTED told me his son was not home, that he was
 in L.A. and would be returning the following day
 some time around 6 p.m. I explained to REDACTED
 that it was important I obtain a stmt. from
 victim. REDACTED related he had talked with his
 son about Father Roemer and he told me his son
 told him nothing had happened. I made an appoint-
 ment to attempt contact with victim btwn. 1900-2100
 hours on 2/13/81.

2/13/81:

At approx. 1930 hours, I drove to the REDACTED
 residence and again was met by REDACTED his wife,
 and two other adults outside of the residence.
 REDACTED related his son had not yet returned from
 L.A. I again told REDACTED it was important we
 spoke with his son. I told REDACTED we could contact
 his son at Colina School or at a later time. REDACTED
 questioned me regarding the case. I told REDACTED

1 that the "S" had admitted touching his son.
 2 REDACTED asked me if questioning his son could
 3 wait until his court appearance. I explained
 4 it was necessary to interview his son prior to
 5 court. I asked REDACTED if his son was home and
 6 he just did not want me to talk to him. He said
 7 that his son was not home. REDACTED seemed to be
 8 evasive about his son's whereabouts and I felt his
 9 son was possibly in the residence. I was of the
 10 impression by REDACTED conduct that he really did
 11 not want his son involved with Roemer's case and
 12 was sympathetic towards his plight.

13 No further effort to interview REDACTED by this
 14 officer.

15 E. REDACTED

16 On February 2, 1981, Detective Kelli McIlvain of the
 17 Ventura County Sheriff's Office submitted the following
 18 report:

19 This date I talked with REDACTED
 20 Director, of Special Education and Special Services,
 21 Conejo Valley Unified School District, 1400 East
 22 Janss Road, Thousand Oaks, REDACTED

23 He related in late October or early November 1980,
 24 a previous student, REDACTED
 25 told his mother that suspect, after a church-
 26 related class, had rubbed his stomach and chest.
 27 The suspect shook all over during this action.
 28 Mrs. REDACTED told REDACTED (Acacia School),
 REDACTED; teacher at the time. Mrs. REDACTED was
 advised to phone the Ventura Sheriff's Department
 with this info.

The possible victim now lives at REDACTED
 REDACTED REDACTED, and REDACTED
 School.

Approximately 1600 hours, this date, Sgt. REDACTED
 and I attempted to contact victim at his
 residence. Sgt. REDACTED talked with REDACTED
 (victim's Dad) who said he would have his wife
 contact us if she had any information.

On February 17, 1981, Detective Kelli McIlvain, Ventura
 County Sheriff's Department, interviewed REDACTED, REDACTED
 REDACTED, REDACTED Mrs. REDACTED is a special

1 education teacher at REDACTED

2 REDACTED, REDACTED

3 Detective McIlvain reported:

4 Mrs. REDACTED related that in September 1980, Mrs.
5 REDACTED mother of student REDACTED, told her the
6 following: Father Roemer, after either CCD or
7 class or altar boy class, had put his hand inside
8 REDACTED shirt and stroked his stomach. While doing
9 this, Father Roemer began to tremble all over.

10 Mrs. REDACTED thinks this occurrence was in June of
11 1980. After learning of this in September, she
12 immediately gave the information to her supervisor,
13 REDACTED and then to Dr. REDACTED, Director of
14 Special Education of Conejo Valley Unified School
15 District. (Prior to REDACTED) At a later
16 date, she gave the information to REDACTED
17 She recalls she went to REDACTED because Father
18 Roemer was on Acacia School campus talking and
19 visiting with students about once a week. It was
20 Father Roemer's practice for at least school year
21 79-80 and 80-81 (to time of arrest) to come to
22 Acacia School during the lunch hour on Mondays.
23 Mrs. REDACTED knew of no formal purpose/reason for
24 his visits. She recalls that after her discussion
25 with Mrs. REDACTED Father Roemer quit coming to
26 her class table in the cafeteria as he had done in
27 the past. He stopped visiting as much with REDACTED
28 REDACTED Mrs. REDACTED said that another student of
hers, REDACTED, 11 or 12 years, had told her
that Father Roemer was his "favorite rabbi" because
Father Roemer had kissed him on the cheek. REDACTED
later told her that Father Roemer had invited him
to his home. Mrs. REDACTED does not think REDACTED
visited Father Roemer at his residence because the
newspaper article of his arrest was printed shortly
after her talk with REDACTED

21 She learned that Father Roemer was often on Glenwood
22 Elementary School campus and had filled out some
23 sort of on-campus application for Redwood School.
24 Mrs. REDACTED did not know if he had ever filled out
25 any similar application for REDACTED in the
26 past. She knew of no other person who was routinely
27 on REDACTED campus without a formal purpose.

26 WHEREFORE, The People of the State of California
27 respectfully submit this Statement of Facts as proof of the
28 factual basis of the pleas of nolo contendere by Donald Patrick

1. Roemer to three counts of violation of section 288(a) of the
2. Penal Code (Counts I, II, and III of the Information).

3. DATED:

4. Respectfully submitted,
5. MICHAEL D. BRADBURY, District Attorney
6. County of Ventura, State of California

7.
8. By _____
9. JOSEPH E. TAYLOR, JR.
10. Deputy District Attorney

11.
12.
13.
14.
15.
16.
17.
18.
19.
20.
21.
22.
23.
24.
25.
26.
27.
28.

jo

6546

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

EXHIBIT "A"

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

6547

1 INTERVIEW OF DONALD P. ROEMER BY KELLI MC ILVAIN,

2
3 DR = Donald Roemer
4 REDACTED = REDACTED
5

6 (unintelligible)

7 KM: And your date of birth.

8 DR: REDACTED

9 KM: And your residence address?

10 DR: REDACTED

11 KM: Do you have your own phone there?

12 DR: Yes. Well, there's a _____

13 KM: Okay. Is the house phone kinda like your work phone?

14 DR: That's a work phone.

15 KM: And what's your --

16 DR: REDACTED

17 KM: I'd like to talk to you about the information _____ I have
18 to read you your rights. Because at this point you are
19 a suspect in the crime of child molest. Okay?

20 DR: Okay.

21 KM: You understand that you're suspected of committing the
22 crime of child molest. Do you understand?

23 DR: Uh-huh.

24 KM: You have the right to remain silent. Do you understand?

25 DR: Uh-huh.

26 KM: If you give up that right, anything you say can and will
27 be used against you in a court of law. Do you understand?

28 You have the right to talk to a lawyer and have him

EXHIBIT "A"

6548

1. you understand?

2 DR:

3 KM: If you cannot afford to hire a lawyer, one will be

4 appointed to represent you before any questioning at no

5 cost to you if you wish one. Do you understand?

6 DR:

7 KM: Do you understand all these rights that I've explained

8 to you? Do you have any questions about these rights?

9 DR: No, I don't think so.

10 KM: Having these rights in mind, do you wish to give up these

11 rights and talk to me about the charges against you?

12 DR: I'd rather talk to you.

13 KM: You would?

14 DR: Uh-huh.

15 KM: Okay. Do you know a boy by the name of REDACTED

16 DR: Yes.

17 KM: Did you see REDACTED Today?

18 DR: Yes, I saw him today.

19 KM: What time did you see him?

20 DR: Saw him when he got there for his religious instruction

21 class. I forget the exact, probably about 3:20 to 3:25.

22 KM: What did you say to ^{REDACTED}?

23 DR: What did I say to him?

24 KM: Uh-huh.

25 DR: I asked him--I'm just going to tell you.

26 KM: Okay.

27 DR: I have no problem.

28 KM: Okay.

1 DR: No problem. Because, well -- it, it is a problem, it isn't --
2 maybe it's the best way for it to come out.
3 KM: Uh-huh.
4 DR: I mean, I've dealt with it before on a spiritual basis
5 and it never works and I am having a problem, not
6 that I'm going around molesting children and
7 stuff like that. I'll just tell you exactly what happened,
8 probably exactly what he said.
9 KM: Okay.
10 DR: Can I ask you what he said?
11 KM: He said that ah you asked him to come into an office and
12 look at some pictues --
13 DR: Yeah. My year book.
14 KM: Okay.
15 DR: My year book.
16 KM: Your year book pictures and he said that you had him sit
17 on your lap.
18 DR: Uh-huh.
19 KM: Is that right?
20 DR: And I had him stand up.
21 KM: And you had him stand up? Where did you have him stand up?
22 DR: Just right in front of me. I mean, not expose himself, I,
23 I touched him.
24 KM: Did you touch his penis?
25 DR: Yeah.
26 KM: Did you --
27 DR: Not all the way, but I --
28 KM: Did you stroke his penis?

1 DR: Well, kinda, just kinda back and forth, but I never really
2 grabbed it or touched it all the way.

3 KM: Did, did you do this while he was sitting on your lap?

4 DR: No, while he was standing.

5 KM: What did you say to him when you were doing this?

6 DR: Well, I started out by stroking his stomach and asking
7 him if that felt good --

8 KM: Uh-huh.

9 DR: -- and I he said yes and I just went further. He didn't
10 say anything but yes and he was paging through the book.

11 KM: This was when he was standing up?

12 DR: Well, yeah, he was, he was sitting in my lap first and then
13 I asked him to stand up and --

14 KM: Okay. So then you ah, put your hand under his shirt and
15 stroked his stomach--

16 DR: At first.

17 KM: --at first, and then did you--was he sitting on your lap
18 when you were stroking his penis?

19 DR: I think I did it first when he was, when he was standing
20 up and when he sat down again I did it for a short time,
21 just a few seconds and that was it.

22 KM: So you, you had him sit down, stand up, sit down, is that
23 right?

24 DR: Well, when he first came in he stood up, but then he sat down
25 in my lap, looked at the pictures. That's when I started
26 it--

27 KM: Uh-huh.

28 DR: He stood up, then he sat down.

1 KM: Okay. Did you tell him to stand up?
2 DR: Yeah.
3 KM: Why did you tell him to stand up?
4 DR: So it would be easier or me to get my hand down there.
5 KM: How long do you think, how long do you think this whole
6 incident took?
7 DR: About a minute and a half, two minutes. It really wasn't
8 long.
9 KM: Ah,
10 DR: I know this is hard for you; it's hard for me.
11 KM: I'm sure it is, Father. Have you already told Father
12 REDACTED is it?
13 DR: Father REDACTED really isn't the pastor anymore. Father
14 REDACTED is.
15 KM: Have you already told Father REDACTED
16 DR: I will.
17 KM: How did Father REDACTED already know about it when I called?
18 DR: About what?
19 KM: About ah, a 7-year-old, a young boy making an accusation,
20 do you know?
21 DR: Father REDACTED knew about it?
22 KM: Yeah. I called and talked with you, and you must have
23 got my message because you--
24 DR: Oh, I, I got your message.
25 KM: And the Father asked me is this concerning a young boy
26 and I said that I only would talk with you.
27 DR: It could be that the parents had called and talked to him.
28 KM: No, they didn't. I've already talked with them. Maybe

1 somebody else, or they talked Maybe--
2 DR: How could he have possibly known?
3 KM: Somebody else must have called. This only happened today.
4 DR: Yes.
5 KM: Is it alright if I have a cigarette?
6 DR: Sure.
7 KM: Okay, they have another boy who's name is ^{REDACTED}
8 DR: Yes.
9 KM: He told me something that happened during confession..
10 Would you know what that would be?
11 DR: Uh-huh.
12 KM: What was that then?
13 DR: He came in and sat on my lap for confession, I put my
14 hand under his shirt. I didn't, you know, molest him or
15 anything like that.
16 KM: When ah, when-REDACTED. was in your office, did you kiss hi
17 on the ear?
18 DR: Can't remember.
19 That's the truth, I don't--
20 KM: You don't remember?
21 DR: I don't remember.
22 KM: Do you think you could have?
23 DR: I could have.
24 KM: He also said that when you were stroking his penis and he
25 was sitting on your lap, you were shaking.
26 DR: Uh-huh.
27 KM: Is that true?
28 DR: Yes.

6553

1 KM: When ah, when ^{REDACTED} was in confession and you had him sit
2 on your lap, and you rubbed his chest, did you kiss him
3 on the ear?
4 DR: I don't think so. Did he say that I did?
5 KM: Yeah.
6 DR: If he did, then it was probably right. I don't
7 KM: Have you, you were saying you've been dealing with this
8 spiritually--
9 DR: And psychologically .
10 KM: And psychologically.
11 DR: There's a priest in Santa Barbara that I go to, used to
12 go to on a regular basis, but I haven't seen him in about
13 4 or 5 months.
14 KM: Has anything like this ha--have you ever done anything
15 like this in the past?
16 DR: I've come close to it, yeah.
17 KM: Am I going to find out about other victims besides,
18 besides REDACTED
19 DR: It has happened before, yes.
20 KM: It has?
21 DR:
22 KM: Has it happened before, while in Thousand Oaks at this
23 particular church? How long have you been at this church?
24 DR: For 3 years. Not quite 3, it'll be 3 years this June.
25 KM: And where were you assigned previously?
26 DR: Santa Barbara.
27 KM: Santa Barbara.
28 DR: Never happened there.

1 KM: Have you ever been arrested for anything prior to this?

2 DR: No.

3 KM: How long have you been a Father?

4 DR: 11 years.

5 KM: 11 years.

6 DR: Please be patient. This is painful.

7 KM: I know and I appreciate how hard it must be. Nobody, I'm
8 sure, but you, can know how terribly hard it is.

9 DR: Last year I got the, because of interest in working with
10 kids and it's not just motivated by the problem, last year
11 I got the honorary service award from the National PTA for
12 working with kids. What a farce now --

13 KM: Can you give me an estimate of how many times in the past
14 this has happened, fondling the genitals?

15 DR: I don't know. Two, two times before.

16 KM: And how long ago has this been?

17 DR: It's been within this year.

18 KM: This year? All, January of this year?

19 DR: I don't think January.

20 KM: 1981?

21 DR: Yeah.

22 KM: It's been since Christmas?

23 DR: Well, there was one occasion, right after -- I'm not trying
24 to elude you. I'm just, I don't really know when exactly
25 it was.

26 KM: Ah, other than fondling with your hand -- the other two
27 incidents, was there any type of sexual activity?

28 DR: No.

1 KM: Okay. Have you had very many boys sit on your lap during
2 confession and rub their chests?
3 DR: Besides REDACTED brother, I don't know --
4 KM: Do you think that's appropriate behavior, Father?
5 DR: No, I know it's not appropriate. I, I--
6 KM: I understand that you realize what you did was
7 wrong, but I've got the feeling, from what you said before,
8 DR: No, I don't, I'm not trying to cover up or anything --
9 KM: It's not as overt as what happened with REDACTED, but --
10 DR: Yeah.
11 KM: -- but it's still inappropriate--
12 DR: Yeah, it most certainly is. I have not nearly enough
13 sought out, I think, enough pshchological help for the
14 problem I have. (pause) Like, even after it happened, I
15 think I knew, I really did know --
16 KM: You knew what?
17 DR: That I was I just felt it, I
18 mean, it's not like I haven't told anybody before.
19 KM: Have you told people before?
20 DR: Not people, but this priest that's up in Santa Barbara.
21 KM: Yeah. But you've--have you told anyone else?
22 DR: No.
23 KM: Do you know the names of the other two boys?
24 DR: Ah -- there is one, well there's one kid that sat on my
25 lap in confession and I did it -- REDACTED
26 KM: And how long ago do you think that was?
27 DR: Not long, I think it was two weeks ago.
28 KM: You know how to spell it?

6556

1 DR: REDACTED
2 KM: How old is REDACTED
3 DR: I think REDACTED is 7-1/2.
4 KM: Was he already going to confession?
5 DR: I think he made his first one, but I didn't do it in
6 confession.
7 KM: When did it happen?
8 DR: That was in, in that same room--it's not my office, it's
9 the teachers' lounge. That is in the center of the school.
10 KM: Now would that have been the 12th, Monday the 12th? It
11 would be two weeks ago today.
12 DR: I think, I think that would be _____
13 KM: Was, is he going to CCD? Wouldn't that be about the same
14 thing?
15 DR: It was Monday. You're just talking about in general, not
16 genital?
17 KM: You didn't rub his genitals that time?
18 DR: No. I didn't rub his at all.
19 KM: _____ did you rub his stomach?
20 DR: Yes. And his chest.
21 KM: _____ touch his skin --
22 DR: Uh-huh.
23 KM: Did you show him your year book that time?
24 DR: No.
25 KM: How long did this--ah, how long was it?
26 DR: About 2 minutes.
27 KM: Was this about 3:30?
28 DR: Ah, around 3:30.

1 KM: And besides REDACTED the other incident?

2 DR: One other --REDACTED He's a 6th grader. And that

3 was the same day -- I don't think that was on the same

4 day. I can't remember exactly when that happened, I think

5 it was last week, last Monday. He spells it REDACTED

6 KM: He's in 6th grade, so he's 11 or 12?

7 DR: Uh-huh.

8 KM: And you think this was last Monday?

9 DR: Uh-huh.

10 KM: Which be the same day REDACTED went to confession and this

11 happened.

12 DR: Ah, REDACTED ah REDACTED went to confession -- Okay, when he went

13 to confession was not on a Monday, it was his day for CCD.

14 Yes it is, he comes--he was sick today. So, it was the

15 same--it was the same, think it was--the same day.

16 KM: He was sick today?

17 DR: Yeah. His brother was not there.

18 KM: Okay. So, so it was on the same day with REDACTED Did

19 this happen in the confessional?

20 DR: No.

21 KM: Where did it happen?

22 DR: In the room.

23 KM: In the, ah, the same room we were talking about previously?

24 DR: Yes.

25 KM: Did you have the 6th grader sit on your lap?

26 DR: No. He sat in a chair next to me.

27 KM: And this wasn't during confession?

28 DR: No.

1 KM: How did you have him come into the office?

2 DR: As soon as he got there. It was previous--confess--the
3 confession time wasn't Saturday. It was, it was a special
4 time that Father REDACTED and I have the penance service
5 and they can go to confession if they want. So, that was
6 after 4 o'clock. I don't know the precise time, but this
7 is before CCD. It starts at 3:30.

8 KM: REDACTED

9 DR: REDACTED

10 KM: Well, was he in that office for a prepenance conference?

11 DR: No.

12 KM: What was he in the office for?

13 DR: I asked him to come in there.

14 KM: Why did you, did you ask him to come in to look at
15 anything or for what reason?

16 DR: I jus--he's in a special class at school.

17 KM: Uh-huh.

18 DR: Not at our school, but at REDACTED and I asked him to come
19 in to see how he was doing because I didn't see him at
20 lunch that day when I was there.

21 KM: What did you say to him, while you were rubbing his chest?

22 DR: I just asked him how things were going, just had like a
23 general conversation.

24 KM: You were jus--and you were rubbing his chest while you
25 were having a general conversation?

26 DR: Uh-huh, yes.

27 KM: Well, did he seem alarmed?

28 DR: No. You're asking me for a fact.

6559

1 KM: Yeah. Yeah, I know.
2 DR:
3 KM: Well, that's right.
4 DR: I know what I'm doing is -- wrong.
5 KM: I'm just trying to see--you're sitting side-by-side--
6 DR: And I reached over like this.
7 (pause)
8 KM: Rubbing his chest.
9 DR: Yeah.
10 KM: Did you have an erection when you were doing this?
11 DR: Yes.
12 KM: Did you have an erection when you were doing this to ah,
13 REDACTED
14 DR: Yes.
15 KM: Did you ejaculate?
16 DR: Ah, yes.
17 KM: Did you ejaculate while rubbing the chest?
18 DR: Ah, I can't remember.
19 KM: Okay. Do you remember if you ejaculated after rubbing
20 REDACTED ?
21 DR: Ah, today you mean?
22 KM: No REDACTED wasn't -- today.
23 DR: Oh, that's right, ah no. That was different.
24 KM: But you had an erection when, you -- with REDACTED
25 DR: Uh-huh.
26 KM: And you had an erection when you were with REDACTED
27 (pause)
28 DR: Yes.

6560

1 KM: Have you ever done anything like this with any little
2 girls?

3 DR: No.

4 KM: Well, it was 2 weeks ago with REDACTED a week ago with
5 REDACTED and REDACTED and today with REDACTED Is there anything else,
6 Father, is there anything else that will come to light,
7 that you think you should talk about now?

8 DR: Yeah.

9 KM: What is that?

10 DR: Everything I tell you has to go down?

11 KM: It does, Father.

12 DR: Probably be made public too?

13 KM: The ah--

14 DR: You don't have to answer that.

15 KM: The details of this, I won't make public. It will be
16 public information that you've been arrested.

17 DR: What does that mean?

18 KM: Well, whoever is arrested -- that's public information,
19 just point of fact -- that's what it is, public information,
20 but I won't be talking to the press, myself, about
21 details of the case. And I know that that is very
22 frightening from your position right now. But the real
23 point is this activity is wrong -- it's gotta be stopped.
24 That's the important part.

25 DR: Right.

26 KM:

27 DR: I understand. I -- but, like how it's stopped --

28 KM: Yeah. Important too.

6561

1 DR: What, what kind of help can I get, if any at all?
2 KM: What kind of psychiatric help?
3 DR: Is that part of the procedure?
4 KM: It is part of the procedure, you will be ah, evaluated
5 by psychiatrists and I, I really don't know what kind
6 of help they will give you. I know it is essential you're
7 motivated to be helped.
8 DR: Yeah. There's no doubt about it, it's kind of like trying
9 and trying and trying not to get involved in that, failing
10 over and over again and not knowing what to do.
11 KM: Fighting it and fighting it.
12 DR: Fighting it and not knowing how to handle it anymore.
13 Fooling yourself that the more you go and talk to a
14 spiritual leader it's gonna do, and letting it go, you
15 know?
16 KM: There are special psychiatrists for this kind of problem
17 that specialize in this area. Ah, I don't, I can't tell
18 you what, what the courts will do about this. I can't
19 say no, they'll just put you, you know, in a psychiatric
20 program, I really can't tell you, cause I don't know what
21 the sentencing will be.
22 DR: Can I just ask you some questions? I mean just --
23 KM: Sure, go ahead.
24 DR: It'll obviously be all over town. I mean, just tell me.
25 KM: I think that the people in your church have a great
26 respect for all the work you've done and I think that
27 from investigations in the past, you will have some
28 friends that will stick by you and will help you
through this time and ah, I've already heard that

1 you have done excellent work with the youth in the church.

2 DR: That's all shot.

3 KM: Well, people understand that, if the work was done, it was
4 accomplished and you've done it, so I wouldn't say it's
5 all shot. People that care about you are going to
6 be most concerned of handle the whole thing. We both
7 know, there are times when it takes a great deal more courage
8 to tell the truth than it does to lie.

9 DR: I know it. I know.

10 KM: People make mistakes.

11 DR: I'm gonna trust _____, maybe it's for the best.
12 Where do I go from here?

13 KM: Well, I'm going to have to arrest you.

14 DR: Fine. I mean, like do all the rest of those people have
15 to be contacted?

16 KM: They should be contacted. They will be contacted, Father.
17 The parents of REDACTED and REDACTED are very upset, naturally,
18 but they also expressed a lot of concern about what would
19 happen to you.

20 DR: That's great.

21 KM: Is there anything else that I'm going to find out?

22 DR: Yeah.

23 KM: Okay

24

25

26

27

28

1 superior while assigned to St. Paschal's Church in Thousand Oaks. Father^{REDACTED}
2 stated he was the defendant's superior for approximately two and one-half years
3 and speaks very highly of the defendant's talents. He stated that the church was
4 completely unaware of the defendant's behavior and at this point the church is
5 awaiting the outcome of the court proceedings to guide what alternative they will
6 choose. He says this is an extreme tragedy as the defendant is a very talented man
7 and will give of himself to any one. He states that the defendant is a compulsive
8 worker and that he apparently gave in to a weakness that he was not able to
9 tolerate. Father^{REDACTED} stated that the Catholic Church has an intensive
10 psychiatric in-patient program near San Francisco called "The House of
11 Affirmation." This program is up to one year in duration, an intensive psychiatric
12 institution where wayward Catholic priests can receive therapy. He states that the
13 defendant is now aware of that alternative and Father^{REDACTED} stated that he hopes
14 the court will consider that alternative when sentencing the defendant.

15 EVALUATION:

16 Sentencing Alternatives: The defendant pled nolo contendere to three counts
17 of violating Section 288(a) of the Penal Code. Each count is punishable by
18 commitment to State Prison for either three, five or seven years. Further,
19 pursuant to Section 288.1 of the Penal Code and 6302.c of the Welfare and
20 Institutions Code, mentally disordered sex offender proceedings are mandatory.

21 Negotiated Plea: The defendant has entered into a negotiated plea wherein
22 Counts IV (288(a) PC), Count V (288(a) PC), Count VI, (288(a) PC), Count VII (288(a)
23 PC), and Count VIII (288(a) PC) will be dismissed at the time of sentencing.

24 Circumstances in Aggravation: The following appear to be the circumstances
25 in aggravation:

- 26 1. The victims were particularly vulnerable (Rule 421a3).
- 27 2. The planning and sophistication with which the crime was carried out
28 indicates premeditation (Rule 421a8).

The defendant took advantage of a position of trust and confidence to commit the instant offense (Rule 421a2).

Circumstances in Mitigation: The following appear to be the circumstances

In mitigation:

1. The defendant has no prior record (Rule 423b1).
2. The defendant voluntarily acknowledged wrong-doing at an early stage of the criminal process (Rule 423b3).

Probation Suitability:

1. The defendant is statutorily eligible for probation (Rule 414a).
2. There is not a great likelihood that if not imprisoned the defendant will be a physical danger to others (Rule 414b).
3. In the instant offense the defendant, a Catholic priest, molested various young boys between the ages of six and twelve. The molestations occurred over a nine-month period. The acts of molestations varied from the defendant rubbing the victims' stomach, chest and underarm areas to rubbing the boys' genital areas. The majority of the acts were committed on church grounds or while under the auspices of church-related business (Rule 414c1).
4. The victims were extremely vulnerable in that they were young, sexually naive and had placed full trust in the "man of the cloth" and parental figure which the defendant represented to them. There was no physical harm to the victims in the instant offense, but the psychological ramifications are extremely far-reaching as evidenced by the current state of the victims (Rule 414c2).
5. By virtue of the defendant's admitted "sexual fantasies" involving young boys, he planned the commission of the crime and was in fact an active participant (Rule 414c5).
6. Focusing his molestations on young, sexually naive victims and participating in such behavior over at least a nine-month period indicates a degree of criminal sophistication (Rule 414c7).
7. The defendant as both a religious and parental figure appears to have represented to his victims a considerable degree of trust. Clearly, that trust was taken advantage of to commit the instant offense (Rule 414c8).
8. The present case is the defendant's first criminal arrest (Rule 414d1).
9. The defendant professes a willingness and appears to have the ability to comply with the terms of probation (Rule 414d3).
10. The defendant is a 37-year-old graduate of St. John's Seminary in Camarillo. He appears to be of average physical health and his true mental health will be determined in future proceedings. The defendant's family ties are stable and intact (Rule 414d4).

1. The defendant has been a Catholic priest since May of 1970. He lists no military service and financial assets of approximately \$1,000.00 (Rule 414d5).
2. There appears to be no danger to either drug or alcohol addiction (Rule 414d6).
3. Imprisonment at this time would have a traumatic effect upon the defendant and his dependents (Rule 414d7).
4. It appears there would be no undue effects upon the defendant's life as a result of a felony record (Rule 414d8).
5. The defendant is extremely remorseful (Rule 414d9).

Criteria Affecting Concurrent or Consecutive Sentencing:

1. The crimes and their objectives were predominantly independent of each other (Rule 425a1).
2. The crimes were committed at different times and separate places rather than being so close in time and place as to indicate a single period of aberrant behavior (Rule 425a3).
3. The defendant's total criminal involvement concerned multiple victims, however each individual crime involved only one victim (Rule 425a4).
4. The convictions for which sentences are to be imposed are numerous (Rule 425a5).

Analysis: the defendant appears before the court having pled nolo contendere to three of eight charged accounts of child molest. The circumstances and ramifications of the instant offense are extremely aggravated and far-reaching for all concerned. Such factors are clearly supportive of the mandatory mentally disordered sex offender proceedings. Hopefully, those psychiatric evaluations will be beneficial to the court and the undersigned in reaching a final disposition in this case.

Should the defendant now or at a later date be committed to the Atascadero State Hospital, the maximum term of retention is ten and one-third years. The Court's attention is respectfully directed to the fixed term worksheet which is attached hereto and made a part of this report.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is respectfully recommended that criminal proceedings be suspended and mentally disordered sex offender proceedings be initiated.

REDACTED

Community stunned by report of priest's arrest

By FAYE FIORE

Comparing him to a "sacrificial lamb" who is being "hung and crucified" before his trial, several local residents expressed shock and anger about the arrest of a Conejo parish priest on charges of child molesting.

The News Chronicle has received a flood of phone calls after reporting Tuesday that the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer, 36, was booked Monday night at the East Valley Sheriff's Station on a single count of child molesting.

Callers have angrily criticized the newspaper for publishing the report of the arrest, saying publicity should have been withheld until after Roemer is tried.

Roemer is accused of "making advances of a sexual nature" toward a 7-year-old boy who attends Bible study classes at St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church in Thousand Oaks, sheriff's deputies said.

The News Chronicle routinely publishes reports of such arrests.

Roemer is scheduled to appear at 8:30 a.m. Friday in Ventura Municipal Court Division 11 to enter a plea.

The child's parents told deputies that their son began to describe at the dinner table an alleged encounter with Roemer. Sheriff's detectives investigated the situation and determined there were grounds to arrest the clergyman, who has been a priest for 10 years.

Roemer has been publicly commended for his patient work with children during his few years in the local parish, and disbelieving parents are stepping forward in his defense.

"Our priests are constant targets," said Penny Lord, a parishioner at St. Jude's Catholic Church in Thousand Oaks. "All priests are like sacrificial lambs," who are vulnerable to accusations, she said after calling the News Chronicle.

Lord related overhearing people at St. Jude's parish praying for Roemer, who has come to be known as "Father Pat" in the community.

"The people at the church are hurt because they know him and they love him and they want to be sure he's going to be given a fair trial," she said.

Darts of criticism have also been aimed at the sheriff's department, which callers say overreacted to the "remarks of a 7-year-old."

Detectives are caught precariously between justifying the arrest to the public and suppressing important evidence that must be saved for court.

Contacted by the News Chronicle this morning, East Valley Commander Larry Kalsbeek reinforced his earlier comments that the arrest was not made on a whim.

"Obviously, you do not build a case around only one statement by a 7-year-old," Kalsbeek said. "We did conduct further investigation and for those who have concluded that the arrest did not have sufficient

cause, they should hold their comments until the preliminary examination where evidence can be made public in court. But we are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence for arrest and prosecution."

Members of the parish insist that even if Roemer is found innocent in court, his reputation and work in the community will be permanently soiled by the allegations.

"This ruined the man," said Bud Sweeney, a St. Paschal's parishioner who accused the News Chronicle of poor judgment in publishing the article. "There's a lot of bad that could be caused by this,



REV. DONALD PATRICK ROEMER

especially because this man has been working with children for years.

"It's taking from him the very thing he stood for all his life. He's being hung and crucified before his trial. It must be tearing this man apart."

Emotions are undoubtedly running even higher because Roemer has reached out to so many children in the community, prompting the Parent Teachers Association to award him its 1980 Honorary Service Award for his work with Conejo youth.

A News Chronicle article published last April described the clergyman's candidness and sense of humor with the children, as well as his philosophy of "being there" for those who need him.

"For people, or for kids, that's what it's all about," he was quoted as saying.

Bill Sugars, president of the Conejo Valley chapter of Concerned Parents for Stronger Legislation Against Child Molesters (SLAM) said he, too, has been reproved for his comments about the arrest.

The community uproar is hasty, he said, because the public has seen none of the evidence gathered by detectives.

"I would prefer that the community wait until the arraignment is over until they pass any judgment on anybody — whether it's SLAM, the sheriff's department, members of the church or parents.

"I think the community is blindly rushing to the aid of this man," he said. "A show of support is expected, but to make accusations about something they know nothing about is foolish."

Sheriff's detectives are continuing to investigate the case before they take it to the Ventura County district attorney's office, where it will be reviewed for possible prosecution.

and old alike, and we know it's not always easy to catch youth's ear.

Although it's impossible to do so adequately, we thank you for all you have done for us and pray that God will give you the strength and courage to go through this very difficult period.

If there is anything I can do to help in any way, I would consider it a privilege.

HELENE ACTON,
Thousand Oaks.

Is it conditional?

Editor, News Chronicle:

What I have read from Father Roemer's friends and supporters is, "We know that you did not do these terrible things." Is your love and support conditional? Are you saying that regardless of the outcome of this case, we are still your friends and support you, no matter what?

If not, then a terrible burden is being placed upon this human being.

Then what about the children? Are these not also human beings with equal rights which preserve their dignity, respect and trust?

Working with children has taught me that they will try very hard to please the adults in their lives. To conclude that they always fabricate is to condemn children; thus making it impossible for other children to come forward should this ever become necessary.

CANDY CUNNINGHAM,
Thousand Oaks.

Losing patience

Editor, News Chronicle:

I am rapidly losing patience with the News Chronicle. Your front-page headline, "Community stunned by report of priest's arrest," should have read, "Community outraged by slanted news report."

And do not ever again refer to a Roman Catholic priest by his surname only. The correct title is "Father," "Reverend," or "Reverend Father."
LARRY PEACOCK,
Thousand Oaks.

Perverved world

Editor, News Chronicle:

My name is Erika Luneberg. I am 14 and an attendant of St. Paschal Baylon parish. I am writing to you to inform you of my opinion (most likely to be the feeling of many others also).

Today on my way home from school I was informed of Father Roemer's charge and on what pretenses they were made. I was shocked and amazed. Now when I think of it, it is the most appalling, ludicrous, ridiculous idea that I have ever heard. I was previously a member of the youth group and my brother is an altar boy. We both know and like Father Roemer very much. The idea of this is just plain dumb!

As I have stated before, I am 14 and my brother is 12. We are both what would be termed children but we are old enough to know when something is being done. If we or any other children our age or above filed such a complaint, the shenanigans that are going on now would be acceptable, but at the age of 6 or 7? The idea that a man such as Father Roemer should be accused of a crime such as this by the word of a 6- or 7-year-old child is obnoxious! As for the statement of Jessie Kloppenborg of SLAM, "People sometimes believe that if a person

is a man of God, he is above all of this..." I and the many others complaining are certainly aware that a priest is capable of such a crime. I ask you, Jessie, "Do you know him?"

I would most sincerely accept a chance to testify in behalf of Father Roemer and many others would, too. I have one question to ask of you. Is this world becoming so perverted as to claim a simple hug or touch, a sign of friendship and caring, as an act of child molestation? If so, I sincerely wonder what type of crummy world I will live in when I am an adult.

ERIKA LUNEBERG,
Thousand Oaks.

Not ashamed

Editor, News Chronicle:

We members of St. Paschal's youth group would like to comment on the article published on Jan. 27 concerning Father Roemer, and the way it was written. We feel that the article was very biased.

In this country, is a man guilty till proven innocent, or is he innocent till proven guilty? We feel that the manner in which the article was written presents Father Roemer as guilty till proven innocent. We could not see how you let such a sensationalistic article be published, for the only judgment that should be rendered is in the courtroom by due process.

Even if the story is retracted, the damage is done, and has greatly hurt the career of one of the neatest people we know. Father Roemer has done so many nice things for us in so many ways, like just being there when you needed someone to talk to.

In the article written, no names were mentioned in his condemnation, but we of St. Paschal's youth group are not ashamed to know, love and support Father Roemer.

DAN DEMARTINI, BETTY HAUTMAN,
BOB CUSICK, MONICA MARTINEZ,
EVA CUSICK, LAURA GILLETTE,
CYLIE GRASMEIER, LISA FREEBERG,
DEBI CITO, SHERILA BURGER,
SUSAN MCFALL, TERRY MCCANN,
MICHAEL SCHANGKEI, DIANNE BRYCE,

JOHN PASS, PAUL DESLAURIER,
DENISE HOFACKER, SANDY MCFALL,
CLIFF MACCANN, VERONICA DEVINCENTI,
CINDY SMITHBOWER, TODD BENNETT,

CATHY NOSEWORTHY, FELIX MASCI,
Thousand Oaks.

Loud and clear

Editor, News Chronicle:

The News Chronicle is registered as "Official Newspaper, City of Thousand Oaks." A 1979 prize-winning newspaper of the California Publishers Association. You apparently have been doing a lot of things right in order to achieve this distinction. Your "Editor's note" in the Friday Jan. 30, edition points out this fact, but you lost all credibility in your final paragraph, and I quote, "No, we don't print only bad news. Or scandal. Or smut. But I can't help but wonder whether people read anything else that we print, no matter how often or how prominent the printing of it is." Mr. Editor, you said it, I didn't.

When an editor has to wonder if people read anything else beside scandal or smut he has lost the feel of his job. I think the answer came through loud and clear in your treatment of the Rev. Father Donald Roemer case. Your editorial judgment in the prominent printing area is questionable:

however, the Saturday Daily News vindicated your action by using prominent printing space in their paper. The big monkey had to imitate the little monkey in order to preserve family tradition or be scooped.

Several years ago the physical director of the YMCA in an Ohio community similar to Thousand Oaks was under an investigation of a child molesting charge. He was a highly respected family man and a civic leader in the community. The editor of the local paper, about the size of the News Chronicle, recognized the impact that a sensational front-page story would have on the community. He tempered his judgment by writing a low-key, factual article which was read and discussed with disbelief in many homes. When the case came to court all the facts were brought out and the judge placed the man on probation subject to psychiatric treatment. This editor recognized his responsibility in the handling of a delicate subject in a community newspaper. The man was removed from his Y job, but after treatment he took his place as a normal member of society. Many humans, regardless of their calling in life, are subject to character imperfections. These people need to be helped, not destroyed by publicity. Let the judicial system analyze the facts first to determine guilt or innocence and then you can do your thing.

It is a sad commentary on American journalism when any newspaper has to exploit the apparent actions of a sick mind in order to attract readership, especially when an editor wonders "if people read anything else."

GEORGE THOMAS,
Thousand Oaks.

SLAM clarified

Editor, News Chronicle:

Regarding the letter by Tom Puth (Feb. 1) I would like to clarify a couple of points.

In his letter, Puth states: "SLAM is made up of parents who have had convicted cases of this nature. To utter the word 'molest' to these people triggers thoughts of their own hardships. The views of SLAM can only be one-sided."

I am a member of SLAM and have two small boys. Neither of them have ever been molested, nor have I or any member of my family. To my knowledge, the 20 to 30 people most actively involved with SLAM in this area have not had problems with molestation.

We are not a bunch of fanatics out to jail every person who smiles at a child. We are simply parents who are very concerned at the high incidence of child molestings and want to help decrease and prevent repeat offenses through stiffer laws.

Children are vulnerable victims. In their innocence they trust most adults. Adults mean authority. Adults mean love, reward, punishment, approval — so many aspects of adulthood that can be used to manipulate a child.

Children are in the tender process of developing and forming the attitudes and values they will have for life. Abuse at this stage has serious and long-reaching effects.

It is crucial that we listen to and show love to our children and do all we can to add to their protection. How can we hope for a stable, well-adjusted future society if we don't place more importance on their development of healthy attitudes?

As far as the Father Roemer case goes, I am personally not convicting the man (whether I be affiliated with SLAM or not). That would simply be unfair. But it would be equally unfair to discard the boys' story out of hand. Nothing has been proven one way or the other. Isn't this why we have a

judicial system — to try to access the truth and dispense justice? So let's be fair to everyone and keep an open mind until the truth comes forth.

MRS. KATHY AUSTEN,
Thousand Oaks.

Unenviable position

Editor, News Chronicle:

It must come as no shock that your position in the Father Roemer case is an unenviable one. The degree of public reaction to your coverage has been intense, and at times virulent. But there are issues involved that most of your critics fail to consider.

Other cases like this have been covered in your paper, many with the same or even greater prominence. It is hard, however, to imagine a case with the emotional potential of this one, because of the involvement of a priest. That seems to have clouded the issues of responsibility and propriety that an editor must consider. While the First Amendment allows the press freedom to select its subject matter and the coverage given it, it also imposes an obligation, in exactly the same sense, though not to the same degree as the Watergate or Abcam stories. Though dissimilar in subject, they are important in that no one, not the government, not pressure groups, not even private citizens has the right to proscriber what the rest of us shall know. Certainly, there are always groups who would like to restrict coverage of their own activities. Any responsible paper should never back away from a story because of its emotional content.

When any paper abuses the rights guaranteed by the First Amendment, it is the responsibility of all of us to stop supporting you. You have not abused those rights. It must have been with a terrible sense of sadness that you decided to go ahead with your coverage of the Father Roemer story. And it would seem that you feel obligated to fulfill your responsibilities with the amount of letters critical of that coverage.

In a follow-up article, concerning another investigation of Father Roemer, it was stated that any 6- or 7-year-old could not make up such an account of sexual encounter. But that encounter could have taken place with someone other than Father Roemer, and been confused in the child's mind, for whatever reasons. I must take issue with you on the inclusion of that paragraph in your coverage. It would have in no way harmed the thoroughness of your reporting to have deleted it.

It is certainly understandable that the sheriff's department has refused to release the identity of the child and his family who have brought the charges. Judging from the reaction so far, it would not be out of the question for pressure to be brought against that family. It would be tragic if Father Roemer is in fact innocent, and this incident destroys him through a false conviction. But wouldn't it be just as tragic, and as horrible, if he is guilty, and public outcry frightens witnesses from telling their story? And the man would not get the help he needs if he is indeed guilty.

Some people seem to interpret this as an attack on their religious beliefs. It is not such an attack. Father Roemer is a man, and just might be as frail as any of the rest of us. One can only hope that the truth will ultimately be known.

DON HUNT,
Newbury Park.

(With this letter, we will suspend publication of letters on the subject pending further developments. — EDITOR)

Parents of molested kids mad at Catholic Church

By GREGG ZOROYA
Special to The News Chronicle

Parents of children molested by a priest in 1980 testified today about their children's suffering and blamed the Catholic Church for doing nothing to help them.

"We thought the church would step forward and say, 'Hey, what can we do to help?' But they haven't done a damn thing," said the father of a 14-year-old boy who was molested by the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer of St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church in Thousand Oaks.

Roemer, 38, faces sentencing today by Ventura County Superior Court Judge Robert Shaw, following a glowing progress report from Atascadero State Hospital, where the priest was committed after his conviction in 1981 for child molestation.

Deputy District Attorney Joe Taylor is seeking restitution for the victims' families to help parents pay for therapy.

The testimony today by several of those parents proved a serious indictment of the Catholic archdiocese.

During a tense moment this morning, one boy's mother testified that her distraught son finally told her on Christmas Day 1980 about being molested by Roemer several months earlier.

Her son told her that during a church-sponsored camping trip in San Bernardino

County, he was molested at night in the cot where he was sleeping.

She quoted her son as saying, "As he (Roemer) was talking about how wonderful God was . . . he started moving his hands down into my pants."

The woman said her son felt something was wrong with him, that he had done a terrible thing.

The parents placed their sons in therapy programs, but several said they can no longer afford the payments. All the parents talked about how the molestations had changed their children's personalities and their own views of the church.

"Did you look to the church for support, help and assistance?" Taylor asked one mother.

"I did," she answered. "I called Catholic Social Services and told them. And they said they couldn't get involved."

"In fact, I wrote a very long, appealing letter to Cardinal (Timothy) Manning, and I got a brief note back from his secretary saying they would pray for us. I was heartbroken."

Then, she added, "After two years, they (church officials) have done nothing."

Shaw must decide whether to send Roemer to prison or place him on some kind of restricted probation grant. The judge must also decide what, if any, restitution should be provided to the victims.

1981

MICHAEL D. BRADBURY
District Attorney
JOSEPH E. TAYLOR
Deputy District Attorney
800 South Victoria Avenue
Ventura, CA 93009

Telephone (805) 654-2518

Attorney for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF VENTURA

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)
Plaintiff,)
vs.)
DONALD PATRICK ROEMER,)
Defendant.)

COURT NO.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

TOPICAL INDEX

	<u>PAGE</u>
1	
2	
3	1
4	2
5	2
6	2
7	2
8	2
9	2
10	4
11	4
12	4
13	4
14	5
15	8
16	9
17	9
18	10
19	
20	11
21	11
22	11
23	
24	12
25	12
26	
27	13
28	

	<u>PAGE</u>
1	
2	<u>N. COUNT IV: REDACTED , PC 288(a)</u> 14
3	Statement of REDACTED to VSO Sergeant 14
4	Jack Hughes
5	Statement of REDACTED to District 15
6	Attorney Investigator Pete Smart
7	<u>N. COUNT V: REDACTED PC 288(a)</u> 16
8	Statement of Mrs. REDACTED 16
9	mother) to VSO Detective Kelli McIlvain
10	Efforts by District Attorney's Office to 17
11	Interview REDACTED
12	<u>COUNT VI: REDACTED , PC 288(a)</u> 18
13	Statement of REDACTED to VSO Detective 18
14	Kelli McIlvain
15	Statement of REDACTED to District Attorney 18
16	Investigator Pete Smart
17	Statement of Mrs. REDACTED to District 19
18	Attorney Investigator Pete Smart
19	<u>COUNT VII: REDACTED PC 288(a)</u> 20
20	Statement of REDACTED to VSO Detective 20
21	Kelli McIlvain
22	Statement of REDACTED to District Attorney 21
23	Investigator Pete Smart
24	<u>COUNT VIII: REDACTED , PC 288(a)</u> 22
25	Report of VSO Deputy REDACTED 22
26	Statement of REDACTED 22
27	Statement of REDACTED (REDACTED mother) 23
28	Report of VSO Detective REDACTED 23
	Statement of REDACTED 23

	<u>PAGE</u>
1	
2	Statement of REDACTED 23
3	Report of VSO Lt. Braden McKinley 24
4	Contact with Father REDACTED Sacred Heart 24
5	Contact with REDACTED and discussion
6	concerning Father REDACTED 24
7	Report of District Attorney Investigator Pete Smart 24
8	Statement of Mrs. REDACTED 25
9	Statement of REDACTED 25
10	Statement of Mrs. REDACTED concerning
11	conversations with Father REDACTED 26
12	Efforts to Interview Father REDACTED 27
13	
14	ADDITIONAL VICTIMS 28
15	A. REDACTED 28
16	Statement of REDACTED to VSO
17	Detective Kelli McIlvain 28
18	Statement of REDACTED to District
19	Attorney Investigator Pete Smart 28
20	B. REDACTED 30
21	Statement of REDACTED to VSO
22	Detective Kelli McIlvain 30
23	C. REDACTED 30
24	Statement of REDACTED to VSO Sergeant
25	Jack Hughes 30
26	D. REDACTED 31
27	Report of VSO Deputy REDACTED 31
28	Efforts to locate and interview REDACTED REDACTED 31

	<u>PAGE</u>
1	
2	Statement of REDACTED 31
3	
4	E. REDACTED 32
5	Report of VSO Detective Kelli McIlvain 32
6	Statement of REDACTED Director of Special Education, Conejo Valley Unified School District 32
7	Efforts to contact REDACTED 32
8	
9	Statement of REDACTED Teacher of Special Education 32
10	
11	EXHIBIT "A"
12	Verbatim transcript of first 30 minutes of taped statement of Donald Patrick Roemer
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

1
2 INTRODUCTION

3 The following "Statement of Facts" prepared by the People
4 of the State of California includes all statements taken in
5 the case by investigators of the Ventura County Sheriff's
6 Department and the Ventura County District Attorney's Office.

7 The material is organized by the order of the charges
8 filed in the Information, and statements relating to uncharged
9 victims are included under the heading "Additional Victims."

10 A verbatim transcript of the statement of Donald Patrick
11 Roemer is marked Exhibit "A," attached, and incorporated
12 herein by reference.

13 This "Statement of Facts" is submitted by the People of
14 the State of California as proof of the factual basis of the
15 pleas of nolo contendere by Donald Patrick Roemer to Counts I,
16 II, and III of the Information.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

STATEMENT OF FACTS

COUNT I: REDACTED

On January 26, 1981, the Ventura County Sheriff's Office, East Valley Station, received a report of a possible child molest from a Mrs. REDACTED, REDACTED REDACTED.

Deputy Bruce McDowell responded to the call. He reported:

On 1-26-81 at about 1935 hours, I arrived at the victim's home re: a possible child molest. I contacted the victim's parents who gave this account: Mr. REDACTED told me that on 1/26/81 at about 1800 hours, victim REDACTED and the family were eating dinner. REDACTED told the family about the following incident: On 1/26/81, REDACTED went to CCD classes. Suspect, Father Patrick Roemer, asked REDACTED to look at some old pictures. REDACTED said that Father Roemer rubbed REDACTED stomach and then his "doofer." Mr. REDACTED told me that "doofer" means penis in their family. REDACTED said that Father Roemer started to shake. REDACTED said he was scared.

Mrs. REDACTED told me that REDACTED has a teacher and a helper in the CCD class. They are Mrs. REDACTED REDACTED and Mrs. REDACTED (See F/U Det. REDACTED for phone.) Mrs. REDACTED said she called Mrs. REDACTED and told her about the incident. Mrs. REDACTED advised Mrs. REDACTED to call the church and talk to the senior priest about it. I talked to the victim, REDACTED a 7-year-old boy with blond hair and blue eyes. I first showed REDACTED my black flashlight and asked him what color it was. He said it was black. I asked him if I would be lying if I said the flashlight was yellow and he said yes. I asked if it was wrong to tell a lie and he said yes. I asked REDACTED if he would tell the truth and he said yes. Again, I stressed the importance of telling the truth.

REDACTED gave the following account: Today (1/26/81), his teacher, Mrs. REDACTED picked up REDACTED and drove him to CCD classes. The children play in the yard for awhile and then go to class. REDACTED put his books down on a bench away from the other kids; however, Father Roemer came out of his office and asked REDACTED to come inside and look at

1 some pictures. REDACTED went into the office and
2 Father Roemer sat in a chair near a desk. Father
3 Roemer lifted REDACTED up and placed REDACTED on the
4 Father's leg, far enough back so that REDACTED was
5 close to the Father's chest.

6 Father Roemer showed REDACTED a book with pictures
7 from when Father Roemer went to school. REDACTED
8 said it was the kind of book where everyone in the
9 class takes pictures together. I asked if he
10 meant a school yearbook and he said yes. While
11 looking at the book, Father Roemer put his hand
12 under REDACTED; T-shirt and started to rub REDACTED
13 stomach. I asked REDACTED to show me by rubbing his
14 own stomach. REDACTED made slow circular movements
15 on his stomach. REDACTED said that Father Roemer
16 rubbed REDACTED stomach for about one-half minute.
17 Father Roemer then slid his hand down into REDACTED
18 pants and inside REDACTED underpants. Father
19 Roemer started to rub REDACTED doofer. Father
20 Roemer rubbed REDACTED doofer for a couple of
21 minutes and then Father Roemer started shaking.
22 His hands and legs were shaking and Father Roemer
23 said, "I'm cold." REDACTED told me it was hot in the
24 room and that Father Roemer was wearing a jacket
25 or coat. REDACTED told me that he became scared and
26 asked Father Roemer if he could go now. Father
27 Roemer said, "Okay."

28 REDACTED went toward his class and on the way he told
his friend, REDACTED that Father Roemer had shown
him some pictures.

I asked REDACTED where his "doofer" was and he pointed
to his crotch area where his penis would be. I
asked REDACTED if he could tell me another name for
doofer, but he seemed too embarrassed. I asked
him if he used his doofer to go to the bathroom
and he said yes.

I put my pencil on the kitchen table and told
REDACTED to pretend that my pencil was REDACTED's doofer
and to show me how Father Roemer rubbed REDACTED
doofer. REDACTED made several short, fast strokes
on the pencil.

I talked to Mrs. REDACTED again and she added that
Father Roemer was very friendly with children and
has taken several groups on field trips. Father
Roemer is the youth minister and active with all
the youth sports activities. Father Roemer was
not very involved in adult activities.

I contacted Det. K. McIlvain and told her the
above info. She called the church and left a
message for Father Roemer.

1 On 1/26/81 at about 2230 hours, Father Roemer
2 called the East Valley Sheriff's Station. I
3 called Det. McIlvain at Los Robles and she advised
4 to ask Father Roemer to come to the station. I
5 told Father Roemer we were investigating a case
6 and we would appreciate it if he could come down
7 right away. Father Roemer said he wasn't busy and
8 would come to the station. He didn't ask why.

9 REDACTED had told me that this had never happened
10 before and that he never saw anyone else go into
11 the office with Father Roemer before.

12 REDACTED said no one else witnessed the incident.

13 On January 26, 1981, Det. Kelli McIlvain of the East
14 Valley Station responded to the REDACTED residence for the
15 purpose of reinterviewing REDACTED Det. McIlvain
16 reported:

17 Following conversation with Deputy REDACTED, I
18 requested he have the victim and parents come to
19 the EVSO for interview. They arrived a few minutes
20 before 9 p.m.

21 Victim REDACTED, 7-1/2 years, DOB:
22 REDACTED said that today while at St. Paschal's
23 Church, T.O., about 3:30 p.m., just prior to CCD
24 classes (religious instruction), suspect asked him
25 into a small office saying, "Do you want to see
26 some pictures." The victim sat on the priest's
27 lap as the priest showed him pictures from a book.
28 (Described like a school yearbook.) As the boy
looked at the book, the suspect put his hand
inside the victim's shirt and rubbed his abdomen
and chest area. Suspect then put his hand inside
victim's clothing and rubbed his doofer (penis).
The suspect began shaking very hard and said to
the victim, "It's cold in here." The victim
finally asked the suspect if he could leave and
the suspect said yes. After he got outside the
office, he told Mrs. REDACTED
that Father Roemer had shown him some pictures.
He then went to CCD class which starts at 3:45 p.m.
He told his parents what had occurred at dinner.
Victim also said the suspect kissed him on the
neck, near the right ear, as he was rubbing him.
The whole incident lasted about five minutes.

Mrs. REDACTED said she phoned REDACTED (CCD
teacher) after learning what occurred and Mrs.

1 REDACTED recalled REDACTED telling her that Father
2 Roemer had shown him pictures. REDACTED after
3 hearing Mrs. REDACTED information, told her she
4 would contact REDACTED, an active church
5 member, to see what should be done about the
6 information. Mrs. REDACTED recontacted Mrs.
7 REDACTED saying REDACTED said the police should be
8 notified.

9
10 Mrs. REDACTED had already decided to phone the
11 police.

12 Prior to the interviews with the REDACTED, I
13 phoned the church and left a message with Father
14 REDACTED to have Father Roemer phone me
15 as soon as possible.

16 The suspect returned the call around 2245 hours.
17 Deputy REDACTED talked with him and asked if he
18 could come to EVSO. He said he would.

19
20 STATEMENT OF DONALD PATRICK ROEMER

21 Detective McIlvain's report continues:

22 I interviewed suspect in the EVSO on tape,
23 following Miranda waiver, approximately 2300 hours.

24 Donald Patrick Roemer, DOB: 3-17-44, 36 years,
25 REDACTED T.O. W-496-0222. L-495-8717.
26 Following is a narrative summary of taped
27 interview.

28 The suspect, who has been a Catholic priest for 11
years, said that everything that REDACTED
said was probably true. Today, 1-26-81 around
3:30 p.m., he asked the boy into the teachers'
lounge on churchgrounds, had him sit on his lap,
stroked his stomach, abdomen, and genitals. He
also had the boy stand up next to him for awhile
and stroked his penis. As the boy was sitting on
his lap, he did begin to shake. He did make a
remark about it being cold to cover up for the
shaking. The suspect did have an erection and an
ejaculation resultant from the fondling. The
victim asked if he could go out to play and Father
Roemer said yes. The total time suspect was
stroking victim was about two minutes. When asked
if he kissed the victim, he said he didn't recall,
but if the victim said he kissed him, then he did.
The suspect said he knew when the boy left the
office that he would be found out. He also heard
the victim yell to Mrs. REDACTED that Father
Roemer had just shown him pictures.

1 Suspect said he has been struggling with feelings
2 of a homosexual nature since he was young and
3 sought assistance while assigned to a parish in
4 Santa Barbara through a church psychologist.

5 The suspect also admitted that information given
6 by REDACTED was true and did occur on 1-18-81.
7 (See statements of REDACTED under Count II.)

8 Also on 1-19-81, while in the teachers' lounge at
9 3:30 p.m., he rubbed the stomach, chest, and
10 underarm area of REDACTED, 6th grade, 11 years.
11 (See statements of REDACTED under Count III.)

12 Two weeks ago, 1-12-81, teachers' lounge, he rubbed
13 stomach, chest of REDACTED 7-1/2 years.
14 (See statements of REDACTED under
15 Count IV.)

16 Father Roemer took a group of boys on a trip to
17 San Diego during the week following Christmas,
18 1980. They stayed in one hotel room with two
19 double beds. During this trip, at night, believing
20 REDACTED, 14 years, to be asleep next to him in the
21 bed, he touched his genitals.

22 Also during this trip, while sleeping with REDACTED
23 REDACTED, 14 years, he attempted to touch his
24 genitals, but the boy had not been asleep. He got
25 out of the bed and went and laid down on the
26 floor. The suspect asked him what was wrong and
27 the boy replied, "You felt too low." The suspect
28 then told the boy he would never do anything like
that (to cover up his actions) and that the boy
was wrong about his intentions. (See statements
of REDACTED under Count VII.)

1 The suspect also related that he had use of a
2 ranch in Fillmore, via relatives, from approximately
3 August 1979 to August 1980 where he often took
4 boys for the weekend or overnight. They would
5 sleep in sleeping bags on the living room floor.
6 REDACTED 13 years, and REDACTED
7 14 years, on separate occasions (one time each)
8 were stroked on stomach and chest area. (See
9 statements of REDACTED, pages 28 to 30,
10 and REDACTED, pages 31 to 32.)

11 He stroked genitals and stomach of REDACTED
12 14 years, while asleep at the ranch on one, maybe
13 two occasions. (See statement of REDACTED,
14 page 30.)

15 He also stroked stomach, chest area of REDACTED
16 REDACTED two or three times in the teachers' lounge

1 on churchgrounds.

2 The suspect was very cooperative, appeared truthful.
3 He said he usually had an erection during the
stroking activity and sometimes he ejaculated.

4 Suspect placed under arrest and booked EVSO.
5 Attached are photos of children in his wallet.
Red arrow is photo of REDACTED , victim #2.

6 In a report prepared by Detective McIlvain on January 29,
7 1981, she stated:

8 On January 29, 1981, approximately 1615 hours, at
9 the direction of Deputy District Attorney REDACTED
REDACTED , and while my conversation of 1/26/81 with
10 suspect Donald Patrick Roemer was still fresh in
my mind, I listened to the taped recording of that
11 conversation. The following is my word-for-word
accounting of the conversation from its beginning
12 through the Miranda waiver. All responses of
suspect are underlined. My statement/questions
13 are in quotes.

14 "I don't know if you are aware of the fact that
there is a family in Thousand Oaks that has a
15 young boy that is giving information accusing you
of child molest. The information was given this
16 evening and I felt like we should try to get in
touch with you as soon as we possibly could because
17 of the sensitivity of it. What is your whole
name, Father?"

18 Donald Patrick Roemer.

19 "And your date of birth?"

20 March 17, '44.

21 "Making you"

22 36.

23 "And your residence address?"

24 REDACTED

25 "Do you have your own phone there?"

26 Yes. Well, there's a house phone and I have a
27 private phone. The house phone is REDACTED

28 "The house phone is kind of like a work phone
isn't it?"

1 It's a work phone and I have a private line. REDACTED
2 REDACTED

3 "I'd like to talk to you about the information
4 given, but I have to read you your rights because
5 at this point you are a suspect in the crime of
6 child molest. Okay."

7 Yes (suspect nods yes)

8 "You understand that you're suspected of committing
9 the crime of child molest? Do you understand?"

10 (Suspect nods head) Inaudible yes.

11 "You have the right to remain silent. Do you
12 understand?"

13 UmmHmm.

14 "If you give up that right, anything you say can
15 and will be used against you in a court of law.
16 Do you understand?"

17 (Suspect nods yes) Inaudible yes.

18 "You have the right to talk to a lawyer and have
19 him present with you before and while being questioned.
20 Do you understand?"

21 (Suspect nods head) Inaudible yes.

22 "If you cannot afford to hire a lawyer, one will
23 be appointed to represent you before any questioning
24 at no cost to you, if you wish one. Do you understand?"

25 (Suspect nods yes) Inaudible yes.

26 "Do you understand all of these rights (cough/
27 excuse me) that I have explained to you?"

28 (Suspect nods yes) Inaudible yes.

29 "Do you have any questions about these rights?"

30 No, I don't think so.

31 "Having these rights in mind, do you wish to give
32 up these rights and talk to me about the charge
33 against you?"

34 I'd rather talk to you.

35 "You would?"

1 Yes.

2 "Okay."

3 "Do you know a boy by the name of REDACTED ?"

4 The interview was approximately 60 minutes long,
5 only the first 30 minutes were recorded on tape.
6 On the tape, suspect discussed activity with both
7 REDACTED boys, victim REDACTED and REDACTED. Off
8 tape, but during second part of interview, he
9 discussed victims REDACTED : in San Diego,
10 REDACTED and REDACTED in Fillmore.

11 A verbatim transcript of the 30-minute taped portion of
12 the interview by Detective Kelli McIlvain of Donald Patrick
13 Roemer on January 26, 1981 is marked Exhibit "A," attached, and
14 fully incorporated herein by reference in this "Statement of
15 Facts."

16 On February 4, 1981, District Attorney Investigator
17 Pete Smart interviewed REDACTED and reported:

18 On February 4, 1981 at approximately 5 p.m.,
19 I interviewed REDACTED in the company of both
20 parents at his residence. Deputy District
21 Attorney REDACTED was present and participated
22 in the interview.

23 REDACTED is a 7-year-old, 2nd grade student at
24 University Elementary School in Thousand Oaks.
25 He attends CCD classes at St. Paschal's Church
26 and has done so for three years. His CCD
27 teacher is REDACTED who also transports
28 him to and from class.

29 REDACTED related the following information: I see
30 Father Roemer every time I go to CCD classes.
31 He always hugs me and kisses me on the head.
32 On January 26, 1981, when I got to CCD class,
33 Father Roemer came up and hugged me. He had a
34 book in his hand and said, "Come into the room
35 where the teachers meet (teachers' lounge) and
36 look at some pictures."

37 When we got in there, he picked me up and put
38 me on his lap. He was holding the book and
39 rubbing my "wiener." He told me to stand up
40 because it would be easier. He started shaking
41 after he started rubbing my "wiener." I asked

1 him why he was shaking and he said because he
2 was cold. He still had his hand under my pants
and I asked him if I could go outside. He
3 said, "Sure" and took his hand out of my pants.

4 I went outside and told Mrs. REDACTED that
5 Father Roemer had shown me some pictures and
6 tickled my chest.

7 When I got home and was eating dinner, I told my
8 Mom and Dad what had happened. I felt like a
"tattletale" for telling them.

9 I have never seen Father Roemer shake like that
before. When he was rubbing my "wiener," I
10 didn't tell him to stop because I was afraid.

11 On February 12, 1981, District Attorney Investigator
12 Pete Smart interviewed REDACTED by telephone.
Investigator Smart reported:

13 On February 12, 1981 at approximately 8 a.m.,
14 I telephoned the above witness regarding an
incident that occurred on January 26, 1981
involving Father Roemer and REDACTED

15 Mrs. REDACTED is a teacher at St. Paschal's
16 Church in Thousand Oaks. She transports
several children to and from CCD classes,
17 including REDACTED and REDACTED, and REDACTED
REDACTED

18 Mrs. REDACTED related the following information:

19 On January 26, 1981, I drove REDACTED and REDACTED
20 REDACTED to CCD classes at St. Paschal's Church.
When we arrived, the boys got out of the car
21 and walked toward their classrooms. I went to
my classroom and then went to the supply room
22 to get some supplies for my class.

23 As I was returning from the supply room, en route
to my classroom, REDACTED came up to me and told me
24 that Father Roemer had taken him into his office
and had shown him some pictures. I made some
25 appropriate comment, like, "That's nice," or
something like that.

26 At that moment, Father Roemer walked up and asked
27 me what REDACTED had told me. Father Roemer asked if
REDACTED had told me that he had shown him some
28 pictures. The discussion was brief as it was time

1 for classes to start and REDACTED and I left for our
 2 classroom. I did not notice anything unusual
 3 about REDACTED that day, but I do recall he may have
 4 been nervous during class. He had to leave the
 5 classroom twice that day to go to the bathroom,
 6 which is unusual for REDACTED

7 In retrospect, I guess it was unusual for Father
 8 Roemer to walk up to me and ask what REDACTED had
 9 said to me. Father Roemer usually does not walk
 10 up to adults and talk to them. He spends the
 11 majority of his time with kids.

12 I know REDACTED quite well and I know in my heart he
 13 would not fabricate a story or lie about what has
 14 happened.

15 I have been very concerned about the entire
 16 incident because of the impact it has had on the
 17 community, the church, the young boys involved,
 18 and Father Roemer. I have a young son who is
 19 involved in the church and also attends CCD
 20 classes. I have questioned him about Father
 21 Roemer and he has denied that anything like that
 22 has happened or has been attempted. I feel confident
 23 he is being truthful.

24 COUNT II: REDACTED

25 On January 26, 1981, VSO Deputy Bruce McDowell
 26 interviewed REDACTED (REDACTED brother), 10 years,
 27 DOB: REDACTED, and reported:

28 He related that on 1/19/81, while suspect was
 hearing his confession, the suspect rubbed
 his stomach, chest, and underarm area (touching
 skin under his shirt). The suspect and REDACTED
 were sitting side-by-side in chairs. The
 suspect also kissed him on the right ear twice.

On February 4, 1981, District Attorney Investigator Pete
 Smart interviewed REDACTED and reported:

On February 4, 1981 at approximately 5:50 p.m.,
 I interviewed REDACTED in the company of both parents
 at his residence. Deputy District Attorney REDACTED
 REDACTED was present and participated in the
 interview.

/////

1 REDACTED is 10 years old and is a 5th grade
 2 student at University Elementary School in
 3 Thousand Oaks. He is Catholic and attends
 4 St. Paschal's Church. He also attends CCD
 classes at the church on each Monday afternoon
 and is transported to and from the class by
 Mrs. REDACTED

5 REDACTED related the following information:

6 On January 19, 1981, my entire CCD class went
 7 to confession. The confession was with Father
 8 Roemer who instructed me to sit on a bench in
 the confessional. Father Roemer sat beside me.
 9 He hugged me and kissed my right ear two times.
 At the same time, he put his hand under my
 10 shirt and started rubbing my stomach, chest
 and under my arm. He continued rubbing for
 30-45 seconds and then stopped.

11 I finished with confession and left. I did not
 12 tell anyone what Father Roemer had done until
 REDACTED told my parents what had happened to him.
 13 Father Roemer has not done any thing like that
 to me before.

14
 15 COUNT III: REDACTED

16 On January 27, 1981, Sergeant Jack Hughes interviewed

17 REDACTED 12 years, DOB REDACTED , REDACTED

18 REDACTED Thousand Oaks, REDACTED Sergeant Hughes reported:

19 REDACTED interviewed 1/27/81. REDACTED
 20 told me he attends catechism classes at St.
 21 Paschal's Church every Monday from 1600 hours to
 1700 hours. He first denied going into a teachers'
 22 lounge, but then stated he did after his mother
 described the room. This interview was recorded
 and REDACTED mother and father was present. He said
 23 that Father Roemer talked to him about how he was
 doing in school. He denied sitting on Father
 24 Roemer's lap. He told me he was afraid of getting
 Father Roemer in trouble. He did say that some-
 25 times he (Father Roemer) put his hands under his
 REDACTED shirt. REDACTED Father Roemer scratching under
 26 his arm. REDACTED denies that Father Roemer scratched
 or rubbed his chest. He did say that he rubbed
 27 his stomach once. He didn't remember when. REDACTED
 then said he didn't want to talk about it anymore.
 28 His mother inquired as to why and he replied he
 just didn't want to talk about it.

1 His parents told me they would call me if REDACTED told
2 them anymore. REDACTED father if REDACTED REDACTED .

3 On February 4, 1981, District Attorney Investigator
4 Pete Smart interviewed REDACTED . Investigator Smart
5 reported:

6 On February 4, 1981 at approximately 3:30 p.m., I
7 interviewed REDACTED in the presence of his mother
8 at his residence in Thousand Oaks. Deputy District
9 Attorney REDACTED was present and participated
10 in the interview.

11 REDACTED is 12 years old. He is a 6th grade student
12 at Acacia Elementary School in Thousand Oaks. He
13 is Catholic and attends St. Paschal's Church and
14 CCD classes in Thousand Oaks. He has been a
15 member of St. Paschal's Church for approximately
16 five years. Through his association with the
17 church, he is acquainted with the defendant,
18 Father Roemer.

19 REDACTED related the following information:

20 On January 5, 1981, while attending CCD classes on
21 the churchgrounds, I was talking to Father Roemer
22 about my new school. I was telling him that
23 nobody there liked me and that was bothering me.
24 Father Roemer said he knew that and asked me to go
25 into the teachers' lounge with him to talk about
26 it.

27 We went into the teachers' lounge and sat down on
28 individual chairs. They were placed one behind
the other. I sat down and Father Roemer sat
directly behind me. We were talking about my new
school. Father Roemer started rubbing my stomach
and chest, under my shirt. He started shaking
while he was rubbing me. He continued rubbing my
stomach and chest for approximately five minutes.
(At this point I asked him to estimate when five
minutes had lapsed. We continued talking and REDACTED
interrupted to tell me that five minutes had
passed. The actual time that had lapsed was five
minutes and six seconds, as timed by REDACTED
stopwatch.

The next incident occurred the following week
(January 12, 1981) at CCD classes. Father Roemer
took me into the nurse's office. I thought he
wanted to talk to me about my new school. I sat
on a couch and Father Roemer sat behind me. He

1 started rubbing my chest and under my arms. His
 2 hand was under my shirt while he was rubbing.
 3 This lasted for about three minutes and Father
 4 Roemer was shaking while he rubbed me. We did not
 5 say anything about the rubbing, but I was a little
 6 concerned about it.

7 On the following week (January 19, 1981) at CCD
 8 class, Father Roemer took me into the teachers'
 9 lounge to talk to me about my new school.

10 We sat in individual chairs again. Father Roemer
 11 sat behind me and put his hand under my shirt.
 12 He started rubbing my chest and under my arms.
 13 He was shaking, like he was nervous, while he
 14 rubbed me. This time it lasted about eight
 15 minutes. We talked about my new school and I
 16 looked at a magazine while Father Roemer was
 17 rubbing me. About two minutes after he stopped
 18 rubbing, the bell rang and I went to class.

19 This is the last time anything happened. I did
 20 not see Father Roemer when I first went to class
 21 the next week (January 26, 1981). REDACTED
 22 incident occurred on this date.)

23 COUNT IV: REDACTED

24 On January 27, 1981, Sergeant Jack Hughes interviewed

25 REDACTED, 8 years, REDACTED, Thousand Oaks,

26 REDACTED. Sergeant Hughes reported:

27 REDACTED interview, 1/27/81.
 28 I talked with REDACTED with his father, REDACTED
 present. The interview was
 recorded. REDACTED told me he attends catechism
 classes at St. Paschal's Church. He attends
 class only on Mondays. He missed the class on
 Jan. 19, 81, but was there on Jan. 12, 81. His
 father confirmed these dates as REDACTED was not
 sure of the dates. He told me sometimes he
 sits on Father Roemer's lap and they talk about
 football. He plays football for the Raiders.
 REDACTED did not remember when he went to the
 teachers' lounge with Father Roemer, maybe two
 or three weeks ago. He said his father dropped
 him off and he went to the lounge with Father
 Roemer. They left the lounge prior to the class
 bell ringing. He said he did not go in with
 his shirt off. REDACTED said that in the lounge,
 Father Roemer rubbed his chest and stomach. I
 asked REDACTED to show me how Father Roemer rubbed
 his chest. REDACTED pulled up his shirt and put

1 his hand under the shirt. He rubbed his
2 breast and stomach. I asked him what that part
3 of his body was called and he told me, "boobies."
4 He then said that Father Roemer rubbed his
5 boobies. He said Father Roemer never put his
6 hand inside his pants and Father Roemer never
7 asked him to touch any part of Father Roemer's
8 body. He said that Father Roemer only rubbed
9 his chest the one time in the room. REDACTED said
10 that Father Roemer shivered like he was cold
11 while rubbing him. Nobody was in the room when
12 this occurred. He did not tell anyone what had
13 happened and no one has told him it happened to
14 them also. I asked REDACTED how long the Father
15 rubbed him and he told me five minutes. I then
16 asked REDACTED to tell me about how long, to tell
17 me when to stop timing him, when it had been as
18 long as with the Father. REDACTED stopped me
19 around 40 seconds after I started timing him.
20 He told me he did not tell Father Roemer to stop.
21 I asked REDACTED if he knew what a lie was and he
22 told me it is when you don't tell the truth.

23 On February 4, 1981 at approximately 1:10 p.m., District
24 Attorney Investigator Pete Smart interviewed REDACTED
25 Investigator Smart reported:

26 On February 4, 1981 at approximately 1:10 p.m.,
27 I interviewed REDACTED in the presence of his
28 father at his residence. Deputy District
Attorney REDACTED was also present and
participated in the interview.

29 REDACTED is 8 years old and is a 2nd grade student
30 at La Dera Elementary School in Thousand Oaks.
31 He is Catholic and attends St. Paschal's Church
32 and CCD classes. He is acquainted with Father
33 Roemer through his association with the church.

34 REDACTED related the following information:

35 My Dad usually takes me to CCD classes and
36 drops me off. When I get there, I just walk
37 around, usually by myself until class starts.
38 I always see Father Roemer there. One day,
39 Father Roemer walked up to me and said, "Hi."
40 We started talking about football. Father Roemer
41 said he had won trophies and asked me if I wanted
42 to see them. We went into the teachers' lounge
43 and he closed the door. Father Roemer asked me to
44 sit down on the couch and he sat down beside me,
45 about six inches away from me.

1 We were talking about football and he showed me a
2 medal he won in football. He stuck his hand under
3 my shirt and started rubbing my stomach and chest,
4 including my nipples. He asked me if it felt good
5 and I said, "Kinda."

6 Father Roemer had his hand on my leg while he was
7 rubbing my stomach. He was shivering while rubbing
8 my chest and stomach. He started shivering soon
9 after he started rubbing my stomach. When his
10 hand was on my leg, it was close to my privates,
11 but he did not touch them. After Father Roemer
12 stopped shivering, he told me I had better go out
13 now because classes were about to start.

14 I asked REDACTED if Father Roemer had ever done this
15 to him before. He said that he had about seven
16 times before, always outside on the churchgrounds
17 while he was waiting for CCD classes to start.
18 REDACTED said it only happened the one time in the
19 teachers' lounge and that was the only time he was
20 aware that Father Roemer shivered.

21 REDACTED said that he felt that it was "weird or
22 strange" that Father Roemer rubbed his stomach and
23 he felt uncomfortable and thought it was wrong.

24 COUNT V: REDACTED

25 On January 28, 1981 at approximately 11 a.m., Detective
26 Kelli McIlvain received a telephone call from Mrs. REDACTED
27 regarding her son, REDACTED Detective McIlvain reported:

28 Approximately 1100 hours, 1/28/81, I received a
phone call from Mrs. REDACTED She related that
she had taken her son, REDACTED 11 years, to
see suspect for some counseling around the middle
of November 1980. The suspect arranged to take
him to a drive-in movie the Saturday night after
Thanksgiving, 11/29/80. The suspect picked him up
about 8:30 p.m. and returned him early, around 10
p.m. When REDACTED got home, he said he was tired
and went right to bed. Either that same evening
or the following day, she received a phone call
from suspect. He said he just wanted to know how
REDACTED was doing. Mrs. REDACTED thought suspect was
just concerned. Another counseling appointment
was made with suspect, but REDACTED refused to go to
it. Then last night, following press article of
suspect's arrest, REDACTED told her that while at the
drive-in the suspect had touched his leg and he
REDACTED moved to the far side of the car and kept

1 his coat pulled tightly around himself. After a
2 while, he told the suspect he was tired and wanted
3 to go home, to get away from the suspect. Mrs.
4 REDACTED said she had talked with her son's pedia-
5 trician and that REDACTED has some emotional problems
6 stemming from abuse by his natural father and the
7 pediatrician recommended, and she concurred, that
8 REDACTED was not at a state where he should be inter-
9 viewed. She went on to say she felt the whole
10 thing should have been handled by the church. She
11 knows the Roemer family and has felt physically
12 ill ever since the news article came out. She was
13 very upset on the phone, crying. She did say,
14 near the end of the conversation, that she would
15 talk to her husband and possibly consider an
16 interview at a later date (Mrs. REDACTED husband
17 had phoned me 1/27/81 and advised his stepson
18 could possibly have some information regarding the
19 case and he said his wife would bring him in for
20 an interview at 1 p.m., 1/28/81).

21 The District Attorney's Office made repeated efforts to
22 interview both Mrs. REDACTED and REDACTED , but permission
23 was refused by Mrs. REDACTED She stated that her son's
24 emotional condition was too precarious to permit such interviews,
25 and she had been advised by REDACTED pediatrician to avoid the
26 trauma of testifying in court. Mrs. REDACTED refused to
27 disclose the name of the doctor, and refused the offer of the
28 District Attorney's Office to put her doctor in contact with
Dr. REDACTED of the Harbor-UCLA Medical Center so that
the pediatrician would have the benefit of expert advice and
consultation in order to properly assess what the effects of
testifying would be on REDACTED Shortly before the scheduled
preliminary hearing of March 3, 1981, Mrs. REDACTED retained
Attorney REDACTED and directed the District Attorney's
Office to deal with him.

//////

//////

5535

1 COUNT VI: REDACTED

2 On January 28, 1981, Detective Kelli McIlvain interviewed
3 REDACTED 12 years, DOB REDACTED, REDACTED Thousand
4 Oaks, REDACTED Detective McIlvain reported:

5 REDACTED 12 years, DOB REDACTED, REDACTED
6 Thousand Oaks, REDACTED

7 Above witness interviewed on tape 1/28/81 at 1530
8 hours in presence of his mother, REDACTED .

9 He said that during the summer 1980, he attended
10 REDACTED Sports Camp held at St. Paschal's
11 School. It was held from Monday through Friday
12 from about 8:30 a.m. to 1 p.m. He missed Monday's
13 session. On Tuesday, his first day at the camp,
14 the suspect stood close behind him, wrapped his
15 arms around his chest area, leaned his (suspect)
16 head down, chin resting on witness' head and was
17 talking to him. This made REDACTED : nervous and
18 uncomfortable. For the rest of Tuesday he tried
19 to avoid suspect. When his Mom picked him up
20 Tuesday afternoon, he told her that he didn't want
21 to return to the camp and explained what suspect
22 had done. His Mom told him to avoid the suspect
23 and she would come to the field early to pick him
24 up every day and watch him. On Wednesday, witness
25 felt like the suspect was looking for him all day.
26 At one point, while witness was playing soccer,
27 suspect came up to him and said, "You can't get
28 away from me." On Thursday, while witness was
 playing football, the suspect told the witness
 that the witness was a pretty good runner and when
 he (suspect) was in school, he was a good runner
 too. He asked the witness to come to his office
 sometime and look at his sports pictures in his
 high school yearbook.

22 On February 4, 1981, District Attorney Investigator
23 Pete Smart interviewed REDACTED . Investigator Smart
24 reported:

25 On February 4, 1981 at approximately 9:30 a.m., I
26 interviewed REDACTED at the East Valley Sheriff's
27 Office in the presence of his mother, REDACTED
28 Deputy District Attorney REDACTED was present
 during the interview. REDACTED is a 7th grade student
 at Ascension Lutheran School in Thousand Oaks.

5536

1 REDACTED was questioned regarding his involvement with
2 the defendant, Father Donald Patrick Roemer. He
3 related the following information: I attended the
4 REDACTED Sports Camp at St. Paschal's Church
5 in Thousand Oaks on June 16 through June 21, 1980.
6 Father Roemer was present each day that I attended.
7 I was acquainted with Father Roemer, having first
8 met him while playing flag football in October
9 1979, but had no previous personal contact with
10 him.

11 On June 17, 1980, while at the sports camp, Father
12 Roemer came over to a bench where I was sitting
13 with three or four other boys. He said, "Hi,
14 how's it going?" and sat down between me and
15 another boy. He put his arm around my shoulder
16 and started asking questions. He asked me what my
17 name was, how old I was, what my favorite sport
18 was, and other similar questions. While he was
19 sitting there, his body was in contact with mine
20 and on at least two occasions, he placed his head
21 next to mine. His face would be very close to
22 mine when his head was leaning on my shoulder and
23 he would turn to talk to me.

24 Father Roemer said I was a nice boy and that I
25 could run very fast. At that point I got up and
26 went out to play basketball. While playing ball,
27 I saw Father Roemer put his head on the shoulder
28 of some other boys that were sitting on the bench.
I didn't see Father Roemer anymore that day.

When my Mom picked me up that day, I told her I
didn't want to go back because the priest was
doing weird things. After I told her about what
Father Roemer was doing, we stayed there for
awhile and watched him.

Mrs. REDACTED interjected that she watched
Father Roemer go from child to child, hugging,
touching, and kissing them. She saw him rubbing
their faces, heads and upper bodies. The kids
appeared to try to get away from him, but he would
resist their attempts. Mrs. REDACTED stated her
observations made her very concerned about Father
Roemer's conduct and felt he was overly friendly.

REDACTED continued: I returned to the sports camp on
June 18, but did not see Father Roemer on that
day. On June 19, at about 11:30 a.m., I was
getting ready to play soccer. I saw Father Roemer
and tried to avoid him. He pursued me and said,
"You can't get away from me." He came up behind
me and wrapped his arms around me and put his chin
on my shoulder. I started to walk away from him

1 and he walked with me, still holding that position.
2 He was talking to REDACTED and I pulled away
3 from him. I was under the impression that Father
4 Roemer's behavior was similar to that of a homosexual.

5 When the activities were over for that day, I went
6 to the front of the church and waited for my ride.
7 I was sitting on a bench when Father Roemer came
8 up and sat very close to me. His body was touching
9 mine and he put his arm around my shoulder. He
10 kept his arm around me until some other boys came
11 up and started talking to him. The kids and
12 Father Roemer left and I was picked up shortly
13 thereafter.

14 On June 20, 1981, I returned to the sports camp
15 and ran the 50-yard dash. Father Roemer came up
16 and said, "You run very fast." He said that he
17 was a runner in high school and said, "Someday you
18 can come over and look at my annual." I said,
19 "yeah, sure," in a low voice, expressing reluctance.
20 Father Roemer said, "See you later," and walked
21 away. I think he knew I was reluctant.

22 In October 1980, I saw Father Roemer when I was
23 signing up for flag football at Thousand Oaks High
24 School. I hid from him, not wanting him to see me
25 because I was afraid of him.

26 I saw him one time after that in January 1981 at
27 the Westlake Theatre. He was there with a young
28 boy and did not see me. I have not seen him since
that time.

29 COUNT VII: REDACTED

30 On January 27, 1981, Detective Kelli McIlvain interviewed
31 REDACTED 14 years, DOB: REDACTED [REDACTED]

32 Violeta, Thousand Oaks, REDACTED

33 Detective McIlvain reported:

34 Above victim interviewed on tape in presence of
35 his father, REDACTED, approximately 1930
36 hours.

37 He related that he, REDACTED and REDACTED
38 went to San Diego with suspect from December 26,
39 1980 to December 30, 1980, from Friday to the
40 following Tuesday. They stayed in a Holiday Inn
41 in a room with two double beds. The evening of
42 December 26, 1980, REDACTED slept in one bed with
43 suspect. The next three nights, December 27, 28,

1 29, 1980, REDACTED slept in the bed with suspect.
2 On Saturday night, December 27, 1980, REDACTED
3 recalls the suspect and boys laid in bed (actually
4 REDACTED slept on the floor the whole four
5 nights) and talked until about 0100 (December 28,
6 1980). This was the first time REDACTED slept with
7 suspect. As they were all talking, suspect was
8 rubbing his chest, underarm and stomach area.
9 About 1 a.m., they quit talking and decided to go
10 to sleep. The suspect was still rubbing and as he
11 began rubbing REDACTED lower stomach area, REDACTED
12 got up out of the bed and went and laid down on
13 the floor. The suspect got out of bed and sat on
14 the floor next to REDACTED. Suspect asked him what
15 was wrong. REDACTED said, "You rubbed too low."
16 The suspect told him that he had been asleep/half
17 asleep and he would never do anything to hurt him.
18 That it was not his purpose or intention to do
19 anything besides stroke his stomach. The victim,
20 REDACTED says he believes the suspect. The suspect
21 didn't touch him the next two nights. REDACTED said
22 that what occurred is really nothing and he doesn't
23 want to get the suspect in any trouble.

13 On February 4, 1981, District Attorney Investigator
14 Pete Smart interviewed REDACTED Investigator Smart
15 reported:

16 On February 4, 1981, I interviewed REDACTED
17 in the presence of his mother at the REDACTED residence.
18 Deputy District Attorney REDACTED was present
19 and participated in the interview.

18 REDACTED is a 9th grade student at Thousand Oaks
19 High School. He is Catholic and attends church
20 and CCD classes at St. Paschal's Church in Thousand
21 Oaks. He is acquainted with Father Roemer, having
22 been introduced to him by REDACTED at McDonald's
23 Restaurant approximately three years ago. He has
24 socialized with Father Roemer on several occasions.
25 He has gone to movies with Father Roemer and on
26 one occasion, went on an overnight trip to San
27 Diego with him.

24 While attending the movie, Father Roemer would put
25 his arm around him and would rub his bare back.
26 REDACTED said he thought that was okay and didn't
27 see anything wrong with Father Roemer rubbing his
28 back.

27 Regarding the trip to San Diego, REDACTED related
28 the following information:

1 Father Roemer called and asked me if I wanted to
2 go to San Diego. I told him that I would like to
go.

3 On December 26, 1980, Father Roemer, REDACTED
4 REDACTED and I went to San Diego. We
5 stayed in a single room with two double beds at
6 the Holiday Inn in downtown San Diego. Father
7 Roemer paid for the room, our meals, and most of
8 the expenses while we were there.

9 The first night we were there, I slept in one of
10 the beds alone. Father Roemer and REDACTED slept in
11 the other bed and REDACTED slept on the floor. The
12 next night, I slept in bed with Father Roemer. I
13 slept in my boxer shorts and Father Roemer wore
pajamas.

14 Father Roemer started rubbing my back. He also
15 rubbed my stomach and chest. He was not saying
16 anything about what he was doing. I was uncom-
17 forttable and got out of bed. Father Roemer got
18 out of bed and asked me what was wrong. I told
19 him I was uncomfortable and that he had "rubbed a
20 little too low."

21 Father Roemer said he was half asleep and didn't
22 know what was going on. He apologized and said he
23 was sorry if he had annoyed me.

24 COUNT VIII: REDACTED

25 On December 27, 1980, Deputy Joseph Cipollini of the
26 Ventura County Sheriff's Department interviewed REDACTED
27 REDACTED, REDACTED Newbury Park, REDACTED. Deputy
28 Cipollini reported:

29 I responded to REDACTED, Newbury Park,
30 where I contacted victim REDACTED, a 6-year-
31 old boy. I asked REDACTED to tell me what happened
32 in his own words.

33 REDACTED said that, "Awhile" ago, he and his family
34 went camping with a church group. One night they
35 were there, he asked suspect (he calls him Father
36 Pat) to come over to his bed to say his goodnight
37 prayers. After saying the prayers, suspect reached
38 down his pajama bottoms and began feeling his
"penis." He said he did it for about the time it
takes to count to 20. During the time the suspect
talked about "peace." REDACTED did not say or do
anything during this time.

1 I asked REDACTED why he waited to tell what happened.
2 He said that he was afraid that he (victim) would
3 be sent to jail. He also said that suspect has
4 never done anything like this to him before, nor
5 has he since. Suspect has not talked to victim
6 about what happened. REDACTED said he had felt bad
7 since it occurred, so he finally told his mother.
8 REDACTED said he could not give any further details.

9 I talked to REDACTED, REDACTED's mother. She
10 relayed the following:

11 On May 10 and 11, 1980, she and her family went on
12 a religious retreat at Camp Yolijsa in the San
13 Bernardino Mountains. They went with Father
14 Patrick Roemer and other members of St. Paschal's
15 congregation, Thousand Oaks. She said that after
16 they returned, REDACTED no longer wanted to go to
17 church. He seemed to have a dramatic change in
18 attitude toward church.

19 She said that REDACTED told her about the incident on
20 December 25, 1980. She waited to report it because
21 they were out of town. She said their family is
22 very close to Father Roemer and she reported it in
23 hopes he would receive help.

24 On January 28, 1981, Detective Tom Odle of the Ventura
25 County Sheriff's Department reported an interview with REDACTED

26 REDACTED

27 At the request of Lt. REDACTED I interviewed
28 above victim at his home at REDACTED in
29 Newbury Park. The victim stated that he and his
30 father had gone to a weekend retreat with Father
31 Roemer from St. Paschal's Church. The victim, nor
32 his father, could remember exactly when the trip
33 took place, possibly in late April or May of 1980.
34 The victim stated he was in his pajamas at approx-
35 imately 2000 hours when Father Roemer started
36 talking to him about the church and God. During
37 the conversation, Father Roemer touched the victim
38 in the groin area. According to victim, Father
39 Roemer then removed his hand and nothing more
40 happened. The victim's father was asleep in
41 another bunk in the room at the time it happened.

42 I asked victim's mother if she desired criminal
43 proceedings and she stated she was only interested
44 in seeing that Father Roemer received help for his
45 problem.

1 The above information was relayed to Lt. McKinley.

2 On January 5, 1981, Lt. Braden McKinley of the Ventura
3 County Sheriff's Office filed the following report regarding
4 action taken by him in the matter involving REDACTED
5 Lt. McKinley reported:

6 On Monday, 29 December 80, Lt. REDACTED telephoned
7 me and advised me of information contained in
8 original report. On Tuesday, 30 December 80, I
9 contacted Father REDACTED, Sacred Heart
10 Church, for advice on how to best handle the
11 situation, administratively.

12 On Friday, 2 January 81, I telephoned Mrs. REDACTED
13 mother of victim and arranged for Det. REDACTED to
14 further interview victim on that date.

15 Mrs. REDACTED told me that she and her son had
16 spoken to Father REDACTED, Father Roemer's superior,
17 and informed him of the incident, who assured them
18 the incident would be thoroughly handled. Det.
19 REDACTED; evaluation of the victim was that he was
20 probably truthful about the incident.

21 As the incident occurred more than seven months
22 ago in another jurisdiction (San Berdo) and a copy
23 of the report had been sent to SBSO for statistical
24 purposes and victim and parents desire no formal
25 prosecution and they have brought the incident to
26 the superior of suspect, presumably competent
27 authority, no further action is warranted by this
28 department. Case closed.

29 On February 4, 1981, District Attorney Investigator

30 Pete Smart interviewed Mrs. REDACTED and her son,

31 REDACTED Investigator Smart reported:

32 On February 4, 1981 at approximately 11 a.m., I
33 interviewed REDACTED and her son, REDACTED
34 at the Ventura County Sheriff's East Valley Station.
35 Deputy District Attorney REDACTED was present
36 during the interview.

37 REDACTED is a 7-year-old male. He is a 2nd grade
38 student at Bannon Elementary School in Newbury
39 Park.

40 /////

1 Mrs. REDACTED related the following information:

2 I first met Father Roemer about three years ago at
3 a CCD teachers' class at St. Paschal's Church in
4 Thousand Oaks. At that time, I was attending a
5 Catholic church in Newbury Park. About a year
6 later I started attending St. Paschal's Church
7 because of Father Roemer. He was very friendly,
8 maybe even overly friendly, but I liked him very
9 much.

10 On May 10 and 11, 1980, our family attended a
11 family retreat in San Bernardino. We stayed in
12 barrack-type houses. The men occupied one and the
13 women were housed in the other. Sleeping facilities
14 consisted of bunk-type beds, similar to military
15 style. We stayed at the camp for two days and
16 then returned home.

17 I was not aware of any unusual appearance or
18 incident while attending the retreat. However, on
19 December 27, 1980, REDACTED related an incident
20 involving Father Roemer that occurred at the
21 retreat. REDACTED said that Father Roemer had rubbed
22 his stomach and his genitals while he was in bed
23 and had called Father Roemer to help him say his
24 prayers.

25 The incident was reported to the Sheriff's Office.
26 I also reported the incident to Father REDACTED who
27 is the pastor at St. Paschal's Church. Father
28 REDACTED assured me the matter would be dealt with.
Therefore, we decided not to pursue criminal
prosecution. I have not received any feedback
from Father REDACTED as to what action was taken
regarding this incident if, in fact, anything had
been done whatsoever.

REDACTED was then asked a series of questions regarding
the incident that occurred at this retreat. He
related the following information:

22 We got there (church camp) at about 9:30 or 10
23 p.m. We had a snack and then went to bed. We
24 were sleeping with our clothes on in sleeping bags
25 on bunk beds. My Dad was sleeping in a bunk
across from me on the other side of the room. The
lights were all turned off, except for the one in
the bathroom.

26 I called Father Roemer and asked him a question.
27 He came over and knelt down beside my bed. He was
28 still dressed at that time. I asked Father Roemer
a question. He started to answer the question and
at the same time stuck his hand under my pants.

1 He held onto my penis and moved his fingers. His
 2 fingers were wrapped around my penis and he moved
 the lower fingers while holding it. REDACTED demon-
 3 strated with the use of a soda bottle that he had
 been drinking from.) He held onto my penis for
 4 about 60 seconds. He did not say anything about
 it. I did not say anything about it because I was
 5 "too scared to tell him to stop." He was patting
 me on the head at the same time he was holding
 my penis.

6
 7 After about 60 seconds, Father Roemer said goodnight
 and left. I saw him go into the bathroom. After
 8 Father Roemer left, I laid there for about a
 half hour because I could not go to sleep. "I had
 9 nightmares about Father Roemer dying because he
 did sin."

10 The next morning someone said that I fell out of
 11 bed and Father Roemer picked me up and put me back
 in bed. I do not remember anything about that.

12 I thought about what Father Roemer had done to me,
 13 but I did not tell my Dad because I was too scared
~~and I did not think anyone would believe me.~~

14 I saw Father Roemer that day, but only with my Mom
 15 and Dad. Nothing else happened while we were at
 the camp. I saw Father Roemer at church thereafter,
 16 but he never did anything like that to me again.
 He always hugged and kissed me, but that is all.

17 On February 6, 1981, District Attorney Investigator

18 REDACTED talked with Mrs. REDACTED by telephone.

19 Investigator REDACTED reported:

20 On February 6, 1981 at approximately 1 p.m., I
 21 telephoned Mrs. REDACTED regarding an incident
 involving her son, REDACTED.

22 Mrs. REDACTED stated she talked to Father O'Ryan on
 23 December 27, 1980 and again on January 30, 1981
 regarding the Father Roemer incident involving her
 24 son, REDACTED

25 Mrs. REDACTED stated that Father O'Ryan appeared to
 be grateful that the matter had been brought to
 26 his attention. He assured her that the situation
 would be thoroughly looked into and something
 27 would be done about it. He gave the analogy that
 the situation "is like having a splinter in your
 28 thumb, if something isn't done about it, it continues
 to get worse."

1 Mrs. REDACTED stated that Father O'Ryan has never
2 discussed the matter with her since that time.
3 Therefore, she is not aware of any action taken by
4 Father O'Ryan, if, in fact, any had been taken.

5 On February 10, 1981, District Attorney Investigator
6 REDACTED telephoned Father Colm O'Ryan, Pastor of St.
7 Paschal's Church in Thousand Oaks. Investigator Smart
8 reported:

9 On February 10, 1981 at approximately 7:50 a.m., I
10 called Father O'Ryan regarding a scheduled appointment
11 for an interview that he had cancelled.

12 Father O'Ryan stated he had consulted with legal
13 counsel who had advised him not to discuss the
14 case involving Father Roemer with the District
15 Attorney. Therefore, he felt he should follow
16 that advice.

17 I asked Father O'Ryan if he had been advised by
18 defense attorney, REDACTED. Father O'Ryan
19 said he had not. He stated he had been advised by
20 a local legal counsel in the community and refused
21 to identify that person.

22 I informed Father O'Ryan it was essential that we
23 talk with him regarding Father Roemer since he is
24 Father Roemer's supervisor and obviously knowledgeable
25 about the allegations involving Father Roemer. I
26 told Father O'Ryan he would receive a subpoena in
27 the near future. Therefore, he would be required
28 to appear as a witness, without the benefit of
discussing the facts of the case with the District
Attorney.

Father O'Ryan stated he would recontact his
legal advisor and let me know if and when he
would allow an interview.

//////

//////

//////

//////

//////

//////

1 Roemer since he (Roemer) came to St. Paschal's
2 parish and is very fond of him. REDACTED is also
3 active in the St. Paschal's youth program. He has
4 socialized with Father Roemer on several occasions.
5 He has attended movies and has gone on overnight
6 outings with him to Father Roemer's parents' ranch
7 in Fillmore. He has never been alone with Father
8 Roemer on any of these social outings.

9 REDACTED thinks Father Roemer is a very affectionate
10 person. Father Roemer has hugged him and kissed
11 him on the forehead many times. REDACTED claims he
12 has never gone into the teachers' lounge with
13 Father Roemer. However, he has gone into his
14 office and has been shown pictures in a book.
15 While looking at the pictures, they were sitting
16 side-by-side and Father Roemer had his arm around
17 him.

18 On one occasion, REDACTED invited Father Roemer to
19 his home for a swimming party. This occurred in
20 early-August 1980. REDACTED
21 and REDACTED were also present. Mr. & Mrs.
22 REDACTED were not at home; however, were aware of
23 the party and gave their approval.

24 During the course of the party, Father Roemer
25 "tickled" REDACTED in the rib area. REDACTED denies
26 that Father Roemer had ever rubbed his stomach
27 and/or chest.

28 REDACTED has also gone to the movies and on overnight
outings to Father Roemer's ranch in Fillmore. At
the movie, Father Roemer would sit between REDACTED
and one of the other boys who were present. Father
Roemer would put his arm around him and occasionally
tickle his knee. He did not attempt to rub his
back or other parts of his body.

REDACTED and several boys were invited by Father
Roemer to spend the night at his parents' ranch in
Fillmore. They arrived at the ranch at approx-
imately 4:30 or 5 p.m. They went for a walk, ate,
and then sat around the living room telling ghost
stories. Father Roemer had his arm around someone
all of the time.

At approximately 10 or 11 p.m., they decided to
turn in for the night. They all slept in sleeping
bags on the floor, except Father Roemer. He slept
on the couch. Everyone slept in pajamas. They
changed into their pajamas in the bedroom, out of
the presence of Father Roemer and each other.

/////

1 REDACTED denied that Father Roemer had touched or
 2 rubbed him while they were at the ranch. He did
 3 not observe Father Roemer touching or rubbing any
 4 of the others present. There were no unusual or
 remarkable occurrences while at the ranch. The
 following morning they got up around 8 a.m. and
 returned home.

5 REDACTED said that Father Roemer is a very affectionate
 6 person and has hugged him, kissed him on the
 forehead and tickled him. However, he has not
 7 attempted to rub his stomach or chest. REDACTED
 said that Father REDACTED is also affectionate, but
 he doesn't tickle. REDACTED denies being aware of
 8 Father Roemer shaking or shivering during any of
 the aforementioned contacts with him.

9
 10 B. REDACTED

11 Detective Kelli McIlvain of the Ventura County Sheriff's
 12 Department interviewed REDACTED , 14 years, DOB:
 13 REDACTED, REDACTED Thousand Oaks, REDACTED Detective
 14 McIlvain reported:

15 Above victim interviewed in presence of his father,
 16 REDACTED in EVSO on tape.

17 He related the suspect had never done anything to
 18 him. He did go on an overnight trip to the ranch
 19 once. Neither he nor his father could recall the
 20 date. They did sleep in sleeping bags on the
 living room floor and the suspect slept next to
 him in a sleeping bag, but he could not recall
 suspect touching him.

21 C. REDACTED

22 On January 27, 1981, Sergeant Jack Hughes of the Ventura
 23 County Sheriff's Department interviewed REDACTED

24 14 years, REDACTED , REDACTED Thousand Oaks,

25 REDACTED Sergeant Hughes reported:

26 REDACTED interview 1/27/81, 1915 hours. I
 27 recorded the interview with REDACTED with his father
 and mother present.

28 /////

1 He told me he went to San Diego with Father
 2 Roemer the Friday after Christmas. They left on
 3 December 26, and stayed five days and four nights
 4 at the Holiday Inn in San Diego, Room 1003. He
 5 said two other boys went along, REDACTED and REDACTED
 6 (unknown last name). They stayed in a single room
 7 which had two double beds. The first night, the
 8 night of December 26, 1980, he slept with Father
 9 Roemer. REDACTED slept on the floor and REDACTED
 10 slept in the other bed alone. He only slept the
 11 one night in the same bed with Father Roemer. He
 12 said he did not know if anything had happened as
 13 far as Father Roemer touching him anywhere. He
 14 is a sound sleeper, which his mother confirmed.
 15 His mother said that REDACTED is very hard to wake up.
 16 There was no reason he did not sleep in the same
 17 bed as Father Roemer. He just fell asleep on the
 18 floor watching TV. He told me he is fond of
 19 Father Roemer, but would tell me if he remembered
 20 anything happening.

21 D. REDACTED

22 Deputy William Montijo of the Ventura Sheriff's Department,
 23 on February 12, 1981, attempted to interview REDACTED
 24 and made the following report:

25 At approx. 1930 hours, I drove to REDACTED
 26 Drive, T. Oaks, in an effort to interview
 27 REDACTED a victim in this investigation.
 28 REDACTED, victim's step-father, met me
 outside of the house and I explained my purpose.
 REDACTED told me his son was not home, that he was
 in L.A. and would be returning the following day
 some time around 6 p.m. I explained to REDACTED
 that it was important I obtain a stmt. from
 victim. REDACTED related he had talked with his
 son about Father Roemer and he told me his son
 told him nothing had happened. I made an appoint-
 ment to attempt contact with victim btwn. 1900-2100
 hours on 2/13/81.

2/13/81:

At approx. 1930 hours, I drove to the REDACTED
 residence and again was met by REDACTED, his wife,
 and two other adults outside of the residence.
 REDACTED related his son had not yet returned from
 L.A. I again told REDACTED it was important we
 spoke with his son. I told REDACTED we could contact
 his son at Colina School or at a later time. REDACTED
 questioned me regarding the case. I told REDACTED

1 that the "S" had admitted touching his son.
 2 REDACTED asked me if questioning his son could
 3 wait until his court appearance. I explained
 4 it was necessary to interview his son prior to
 5 court. I asked REDACTED if his son was home and
 6 he just did not want me to talk to him. He said
 7 that his son was not home. REDACTED seemed to be
 8 evasive about his son's whereabouts and I felt his
 9 son was possibly in the residence. I was of the
 10 impression by REDACTED... conduct that he really did
 11 not want his son involved with Roemer's case and
 12 was sympathetic towards his plight.

13 No further effort to interview REDACTED by this
 14 officer.

15 E. REDACTED

16 On February 2, 1981, Detective Kelli McIlvain of the
 17 Ventura County Sheriff's Office submitted the following
 18 report:

19 This date I talked with REDACTED
 20 Director, of Special Education and Special Services,
 21 Conejo Valley Unified School District, 1400 East
 22 Janss Road, Thousand Oaks, REDACTED

23 He related in late October or early November 1980,
 24 a previous student, REDACTED DOB: REDACTED
 25 told his mother that suspect, after a church-
 26 related class, had rubbed his stomach and chest.
 27 The suspect shook all over during this action.
 28 Mrs. REDACTED told REDACTED (Acacia School),
 REDACTED teacher at the time. Mrs. REDACTED was
 advised to phone the Ventura Sheriff's Department
 with this info.

The possible victim now lives at REDACTED
 Road, Moorpark, REDACTED and attends Poindexter
 School.

Approximately 1600 hours, this date, Sgt. REDACTED
 REDACTED and I attempted to contact victim at his
 residence. Sgt. REDACTED talked with REDACTED
 (victim's Dad) who said he would have his wife
 contact us if she had any information.

On February 17, 1981, Detective Kelli McIlvain, Ventura
 County Sheriff's Department, interviewed REDACTED REDACTED
 Street, Thousand Oaks, REDACTED Mrs. REDACTED is a special

1 education teacher at Acacia School, 55 Norman Avenue, Thousand
2 Oaks, REDACTED

3 Detective McIlvain reported:

4 Mrs. REDACTED related that in September 1980, Mrs.
5 REDACTED mother of student REDACTED, told her the
6 following: Father Roemer, after either CCD or
7 class or altar boy class, had put his hand inside
8 REDACTED shirt and stroked his stomach. While doing
9 this, Father Roemer began to tremble all over.

10 Mrs. REDACTED thinks this occurrence was in June of
11 1980. After learning of this in September, she
12 immediately gave the information to her supervisor,
13 REDACTED, and then to Dr. REDACTED Director of
14 Special Education of Conejo Valley Unified School
15 District. (Prior to REDACTED) At a later
16 date, she gave the information to REDACTED
17 She recalls she went to REDACTED because Father
18 Roemer was on Acacia School campus talking and
19 visiting with students about once a week. It was
20 Father Roemer's practice for at least school year
21 79-80 and 80-81 (to time of arrest) to come to
22 Acacia School during the lunch hour on Mondays.
23 REDACTED knew of no formal purpose/reason for
24 his visits. She recalls that after her discussion
25 with REDACTED, Father Roemer quit coming to
26 her class table in the cafeteria as he had done in
27 the past. He stopped visiting as much with REDACTED
28 REDACTED REDACTED said that another student of
hers, REDACTED, 11 or 12 years, had told her
that Father Roemer was his "favorite rabbi" because
Father Roemer had kissed him on the cheek. REDACTED
later told her that Father Roemer had invited him
to his home. REDACTED does not think REDACTED
visited Father Roemer at his residence because the
newspaper article of his arrest was printed shortly
after her talk with REDACTED.

21 She learned that Father Roemer was often on Glenwood
22 Elementary School campus and had filled out some
23 sort of on-campus application for Redwood School.
24 REDACTED did not know if he had ever filled out
25 any similar application for Acacia School in the
26 past. She knew of no other person who was routinely
27 on Acacia campus without a formal purpose.

28 WHEREFORE, The People of the State of California
respectfully submit this Statement of Facts as proof of the
factual basis of the pleas of nolo contendere by Donald Patrick

1- Roemer to three counts of violation of section 288(a) of the
2 Penal Code (Counts I, II, and III of the Information).

3 DATED:

4 Respectfully submitted,

5 MICHAEL D. BRADBURY, District Attorney
6 County of Ventura, State of California

7
8 By _____
9 JOSEPH E. TAYLOR, JR.
10 Deputy District Attorney

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

jo

5552

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

EXHIBIT "A"

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

5553

1 INTERVIEW OF DONALD P. ROEMER BY KELLI MC ILVAIN,

2
3 DR = Donald Roemer

4 KM = Kelli McIlvain

5
6 (unintelligible)

7 KM: And your date of birth.

8 DR: ____17-44.

9 KM: And your residence address?

10 DR: REDACTED

11 KM: Do you have your own phone there?

12 DR: Yes. Well, there's a _____

13 KM: Okay. Is the house phone kinda like your work phone?

14 DR: That's a work phone.

15 KM: And what's your --

16 DR: REDACTED

17 KM: I'd like to talk to you about the information _____ I have
18 to read you your rights. Because at this point you are
19 a suspect in the crime of child molest. Okay?

20 DR: Okay.

21 KM: You understand that you're suspected of committing the
22 crime of child molest. Do you understand?

23 DR: Uh-huh.

24 KM: You have the right to remain silent. Do you understand?

25 DR: Uh-huh.

26 KM: If you give up that right, anything you say can and will
27 be used against you in a court of law. Do you understand?

28 You have the right to talk to a lawyer and have him

EXHIBIT "A"

5554

1- you understand?

2 DR:

3 KM: If you cannot afford to hire a lawyer, one will be

4 appointed to represent you before any questioning at no

5 cost to you if you wish one. Do you understand?

6 DR:

7 KM: Do you understand all these rights that I've explained

8 to you? Do you have any questions about these rights?

9 DR: No, I don't think so.

10 KM: Having these rights in mind, do you wish to give up these

11 rights and talk to me about the charges against you?

12 DR: I'd rather talk to you.

13 KM: You would?

14 DR: Uh-huh.

15 KM: Okay. Do you know a boy by the name of REDACTED

16 DR: Yes.

17 KM: Did you see REDACTED Today?

18 DR: Yes, I saw him today.

19 KM: What time did you see him?

20 DR: Saw him when he got there for his religious instruction

21 class. I forget the exact, probably about 3:20 to 3:25.

22 KM: What did you say to REDACTED

23 DR: What did I say to him?

24 KM: Uh-huh.

25 DR: I asked him--I'm just going to tell you.

26 KM: Okay.

27 DR: I have no problem.

28 KM: Okay.

5555

1 DR: No problem. Because, well -- it, it is a problem, it isn't --
2 maybe it's the best way for it to come out.
3 KM: Uh-huh.
4 DR: I mean, I've dealt with it before on a spiritual basis
5 and it never works and I am having a problem, not
6 that I'm going around molesting children and
7 stuff like that. I'll just tell you exactly what happened,
8 probably exactly what he said.
9 KM: Okay.
10 DR: Can I ask you what he said?
11 KM: He said that ah you asked him to come into an office and
12 look at some pictues --
13 DR: Yeah. My year book.
14 KM: Okay.
15 DR: My year book.
16 KM: Your year book pictures and he said that you had him sit
17 on your lap.
18 DR: Uh-huh.
19 KM: Is that right?
20 DR: And I had him stand up.
21 KM: And you had him stand up? Where did you have him stand up?
22 DR: Just right in front of me. I mean, not expose himself, I,
23 I touched him.
24 KM: Did you touch his penis?
25 DR: Yeah.
26 KM: Did you --
27 DR: Not all the way, but I --
28 KM: Did you stroke his penis?

1 DR: Well, kinda, just kinda back and forth, but I never really
2 grabbed it or touched it all the way.

3 KM: Did, did you do this while he was sitting on your lap?

4 DR: No, while he was standing.

5 KM: What did you say to him when you were doing this?

6 DR: Well, I started out by stroking his stomach and asking
7 him if that felt good --

8 KM: Uh-huh.

9 DR: -- and I he said yes and I just went further. He didn't
10 say anything but yes and he was paging through the book.

11 KM: This was when he was standing up?

12 DR: Well, yeah, he was, he was sitting in my lap first and then
13 I asked him to stand up and --

14 KM: Okay. So then you ah, put your hand under his shirt and
15 stroked his stomach--

16 DR: At first.

17 KM: --at first, and then did you--was he sitting on your lap
18 when you were stroking his penis?

19 DR: I think I did it first when he was, when he was standing
20 up and when he sat down again I did it for a short time,
21 just a few seconds and that was it.

22 KM: So you, you had him sit down, stand up, sit down, is that
23 right?

24 DR: Well, when he first came in he stood up, but then he sat down
25 in my lap, looked at the pictures. That's when I started
26 it--

27 KM: Uh-huh.

28 DR: He stood up, then he sat down.

1 KM: Okay. Did you tell him to stand up?
2 DR: Yeah.
3 KM: Why did you tell him to stand up?
4 DR: So it would be easier or me to get my hand down there.
5 KM: How long do you think, how long do you think this whole
6 incident took?
7 DR: About a minute and a half, two minutes. It really wasn't
8 long.
9 KM: Ah,
10 DR: I know this is hard for you; it's hard for me.
11 KM: I'm sure it is, Father. Have you already told Father
12 REDACTED is it?
13 DR: Father REDACTED really isn't the pastor anymore. Father
14 REDACTED, is.
15 KM: Have you already told Father REDACTED
16 DR: I will.
17 KM: How did Father REDACTED already know about it when I called?
18 DR: About what?
19 KM: About ah, a 7-year-old, a young boy making an accusation,
20 do you know?
21 DR: Father REDACTED knew about it?
22 KM: Yeah. I called and talked with you, and you must have
23 got my message because you--
24 DR: Oh, I, I got your message.
25 KM: And the Father asked me is this concerning a young boy
26 and I said that I only would talk with you.
27 DR: It could be that the parents had called and talked to him.
28 KM: No, they didn't. I've already talked with them. Maybe

5558

1 somebody else, or they talked Maybe--
2 DR: How could he have possibly known?
3 KM: Somebody else must have called. This only happened today.
4 DR: Yes.
5 KM: Is it alright if I have a cigarette?
6 DR: Sure.
7 KM: Okay, they have another boy who's name is REDACTED
8 DR: Yes.
9 KM: He told me something that happened during confession..
10 Would you know what that would be?
11 DR: Uh-huh.
12 KM: What was that then?
13 DR: He came in and sat on my lap for confession, I put my
14 hand under his shirt. I didn't, you know, molest him or
15 anything like that.
16 KM: When ah, when-REDACTED was in your office, did you kiss hi
17 on the ear?
18 DR: Can't remember.
19 That's the truth, I don't--
20 KM: You don't remember?
21 DR: I don't remember.
22 KM: Do you think you could have?
23 DR: I could have.
24 KM: He also said that when you were stroking his penis and he
25 was sitting on your lap, you were shaking.
26 DR: Uh-huh.
27 KM: Is that true?
28 DR: Yes.

1 KM: When ah, when ^{REDACTED} was in confession and you had him sit
2 on your lap, and you rubbed his chest, did you kiss him
3 on the ear?
4 DR: I don't think so. Did he say that I did?
5 KM: Yeah.
6 DR: If he did, then it was probably right. I don't
7 KM: Have you, you were saying you've been dealing with this
8 spiritually--
9 DR: And psychologically .
10 KM: And psychologically.
11 DR: There's a priest in Santa Barbara that I go to, used to
12 go to on a regular basis, but I haven't seen him in about
13 4 or 5 months.
14 KM: Has anything like this ha--have you ever done anything
15 like this in the past?
16 DR: I've come close to it, yeah.
17 KM: Am I going to find out about other victims besides,
18 besides ^{REDACTED}
19 DR: It has happened before, yes.
20 KM: It has?
21 DR:
22 KM: Has it happened before, while in Thousand Oaks at this
23 particular church? How long have you been at this church?
24 DR: For 3 years. Not quite 3, it'll be 3 years this June.
25 KM: And where were you assigned previously?
26 DR: Santa Barbara.
27 KM: Santa Barbara.
28 DR: Never happened there.

5560

1 KM: Have you ever been arrested for anything prior to this?
2 DR: No.
3 KM: How long have you been a Father?
4 DR: 11 years.
5 KM: 11 years.
6 DR: Please be patient. This is painful.
7 KM: I know and I appreciate how hard it must be. Nobody, I'm
8 sure, but you, can know how terribly hard it is.
9 DR: Last year I got the, because of interest in working with
10 kids and it's not just motivated by the problem, last year
11 I got the honorary service award from the National PTA for
12 working with kids. What a farce now --
13 KM: Can you give me an estimate of how many times in the past
14 this has happened, fondling the genitals?
15 DR: I don't know. Two, two times before.
16 KM: And how long ago has this been?
17 DR: It's been within this year.
18 KM: This year? All, January of this year?
19 DR: I don't think January.
20 KM: 1981?
21 DR: Yeah.
22 KM: It's been since Christmas?
23 DR: Well, there was one occasion, right after -- I'm not trying
24 to elude you. I'm just, I don't really know when exactly
25 it was.
26 KM: Ah, other than fondling with your hand -- the other two
27 incidents, was there any type of sexual activity?
28 DR: No.

5561

1 KM: Okay. Have you had very many boys sit on your lap during
2 confession and rub their chests?
3 DR: Besides REDACTED brother, I don't know --
4 KM: Do you think that's appropriate behavior, Father?
5 DR: No, I know it's not appropriate. I, I--
6 KM: I understand that you realize what you did was
7 wrong, but I've got the feeling, from what you said before, --
8 DR: No, I don't, I'm not trying to cover up or anything --
9 KM: It's not as overt as what happened with REDACTED but --
10 DR: Yeah.
11 KM: -- but it's still inappropriate--
12 DR: Yeah, it most certainly is. I have not nearly enough
13 sought out, I think, enough pshchological help for the
14 problem I have. (pause) Like, even after it happened, I
15 think I knew, I really did know --
16 KM: You knew what?
17 DR: That I was I just felt it, I
18 mean, it's not like I haven't told anybody before.
19 KM: Have you told people before?
20 DR: Not people, but this priest that's up in Santa Barbara.
21 KM: Yeah. But you've--have you told anyone else?
22 DR: No.
23 KM: Do you know the names of the other two boys?
24 DR: Ah -- there is one, well there's one kid that sat on my
25 lap in confession and I did it -- REDACTED
26 KM: And how long ago do you think that was?
27 DR: Not long, I think it was two weeks ago.
28 KM: You know how to spell it?

5562

1 DR: REDACTED
2 KM: How old is REDACTED
3 DR: I think REDACTED is 7-1/2.
4 KM: Was he already going to confession?
5 DR: I think he made his first one, but I didn't do it in
6 confession.
7 KM: When did it happen?
8 DR: That was in, in that same room--it's not my office, it's
9 the teachers' lounge. That is in the center of the school.
10 KM: Now would that have been the 12th, Monday the 12th? It
11 would be two weeks ago today.
12 DR: I think, I think that would be _____
13 KM: Was, is he going to CCD? Wouldn't that be about the same
14 thing?
15 DR: It was Monday. You're just talking about in general, not
16 genital?
17 KM: You didn't rub his genitals that time?
18 DR: No. I didn't rub his at all.
19 KM: did you rub his stomach?
20 DR: Yes. And his chest.
21 KM: _____ touch his skin --
22 DR: Uh-huh.
23 KM: Did you show him your year book that time?
24 DR: No.
25 KM: How long did this--ah, how long was it?
26 DR: About 2 minutes.
27 KM: Was this about 3:30?
28 DR: Ah, around 3:30.

5563

1 KM: And besides REDACTED the other incident?
2 DR: One other -- REDACTED . He's a 6th grader. And that
3 was the same day -- I don't think that was on the same
4 day. I can't remember exactly when that happened, I think
5 it was last week, last Monday. He spells it REDACTED
6 KM: He's in 6th grade, so he's 11 or 12?
7 DR: Uh-huh.
8 KM: And you think this was last Monday?
9 DR: Uh-huh.
10 KM: Which be the same day REDACTED went to confession and this
11 happened.
12 DR: Ah, REDACTED, ah REDACTED went to confession -- Okay, when he went
13 to confession was not on a Monday, it was his day for CCD.
14 Yes it is, he comes--he was sick today. So, it was the
15 same--it was the same, think it was--the same day.
16 KM: He was sick today?
17 DR: Yeah. His brother was not there.
18 KM: Okay. So, so it was on the same day with REDACTED Did
19 this happen in the confessional?
20 DR: No.
21 KM: Where did it happen?
22 DR: In the room.
23 KM: In the, ah, the same room we were talking about previously?
24 DR: Yes.
25 KM: Did you have the 6th grader sit on your lap?
26 DR: No. He sat in a chair next to me.
27 KM: And this wasn't during confession?
28 DR: No.

1 KM: How did you have him come into the office?
2 DR: As soon as he got there. It was previous--confess--the
3 confession time wasn't Saturday. It was, it was a special
4 time that Father REDACTED and I have the penance service
5 and they can go to confession if they want. So, that was
6 after 4 o'clock. I don't know the precise time, but this
7 is before CCD. It starts at 3:30.
8 KM: REDACTED
9 DR: REDACTED
10 KM: Well, was he in that office for a prepenance conference?
11 DR: No.
12 KM: What was he in the office for?
13 DR: I asked him to come in there.
14 KM: Why did you, did you ask him to come in to look at
15 anything or for what reason?
16 DR: I jus--he's in a special class at school.
17 KM: Uh-huh.
18 DR: Not at our school, but at Acacia and I asked him to come
19 in to see how he was doing because I didn't see him at
20 lunch that day when I was there.
21 KM: What did you say to him, while you were rubbing his chest?
22 DR: I just asked him how things were going, just had like a
23 general conversation.
24 KM: You were jus--and you were rubbing his chest while you
25 were having a general conversation?
26 DR: Uh-huh, yes.
27 KM: Well, did he seem alarmed?
28 DR: No. You're asking me for a fact.

5565

1 KM: Yeah. Yeah, I know.
2 DR:
3 KM: Well, that's right.
4 DR: I know what I'm doing is -- wrong.
5 KM: I'm just trying to see--you're sitting side-by-side--
6 DR: And I reached over like this.
7 (pause)
8 KM: Rubbing his chest.
9 DR: Yeah.
10 KM: Did you have an erection when you were doing this?
11 DR: Yes.
12 KM: Did you have an erection when you were doing this to ah,
13 REDACTED
14 DR: Yes.
15 KM: Did you ejaculate?
16 DR: Ah, yes.
17 KM: Did you ejaculate while rubbing the chest?
18 DR: Ah, I can't remember.
19 KM: Okay. Do you remember if you ejaculated after rubbing
20 REDACTED
21 DR: Ah, today you mean?
22 KM: No REDACTED wasn't -- today.
23 DR: Oh, that's right, ah no. That was different.
24 KM: But you had an erection when, you -- with REDACTED
25 DR: Uh-huh.
26 KM: And you had an erection when you were with REDACTED
27 (pause)
28 DR: Yes.

1 KM: Have you ever done anything like this with any little
2 girls?

3 DR: No.

4 KM: Well, it was 2 weeks ago with REDACTED, a week ago with
5 REDACTED and REDACTED, and today with REDACTED Is there anything else,
6 Father, is there anything else that will come to light,
7 that you think you should talk about now?

8 DR: Yeah.

9 KM: What is that?

10 DR: Everything I tell you has to go down?

11 KM: It does, Father.

12 DR: Probably be made public too?

13 KM: The ah--

14 DR: You don't have to answer that.

15 KM: The details of this, I won't make public. It will be
16 public information that you've been arrested.

17 DR: What does that mean?

18 KM: Well, whoever is arrested -- that's public information,
19 just point of fact -- that's what it is, public information,
20 but I won't be talking to the press, myself, about
21 details of the case. And I know that that is very
22 frightening from your position right now. But the real
23 point is this activity is wrong -- it's gotta be stopped.
24 That's the important part.

25 DR: Right.

26 KM:

27 DR: I understand. I -- but, like how it's stopped --

28 KM: Yeah. Important too.

1 DR: What, what kind of help can I get, if any at all?

2 KM: What kind of psychiatric help?

3 DR: Is that part of the procedure?

4 KM: It is part of the procedure, you will be ah, evaluated

5 by psychiatrists and I, I really don't know what kind

6 of help they will give you. I know it is essential you're

7 motivated to be helped.

8 DR: Yeah. There's no doubt about it, it's kind of like trying

9 and trying and trying not to get involved in that, failing

10 over and over again and not knowing what to do.

11 KM: Fighting it and fighting it.

12 DR: Fighting it and not knowing how to handle it anymore.

13 Fooling yourself that the more you go and talk to a

14 spiritual leader it's gonna do, and letting it go, you

15 know?

16 KM: There are special psychiatrists for this kind of problem

17 that specialize in this area. Ah, I don't, I can't tell

18 you what, what the courts will do about this. I can't

19 say no, they'll just put you, you know, in a psychiatric

20 program, I really can't tell you, cause I don't know what

21 the sentencing will be.

22 DR: Can I just ask you some questions? I mean just --

23 KM: Sure, go ahead.

24 DR: It'll obviously be all over town. I mean, just tell me.

25 KM: I think that the people in your church have a great

26 respect for all the work you've done and I think that

27 from investigations in the past, you will have some

28 friends that will stick by you and will help you

through this time and ah, I've already heard that

1 you have done excellent work with the youth in the church.

2 DR: That's all shot.

3 KM: Well, people understand that, if the work was done, it was
4 accomplished and you've done it, so I wouldn't say it's
5 all shot. People that care about you are going to
6 be most concerned of handle the whole thing. We both
7 know, there are times when it takes a great deal more courage
8 to tell the truth than it does to lie.

9 DR: I know it. I know.

10 KM: People make mistakes.

11 DR: I'm gonna trust _____, maybe it's for the best.
12 Where do I go from here?

13 KM: Well, I'm going to have to arrest you.

14 DR: Fine. I mean, like do all the rest of those people have
15 to be contacted?

16 KM: They should be contacted. They will be contacted, Father.
17 The parents of REDACTED and REDACTED are very upset, naturally,
18 but they also expressed a lot of concern about what would
19 happen to you.

20 DR: That's great.

21 KM: Is there anything else that I'm going to find out?

22 DR: Yeah.

23 KM: Okay

24

25

26

27

28

Div 8 12
1:30
Feb 19

VENTURA COUNTY MUNICIPAL COURT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Defense
Jan 1981

HALL OF JUSTICE Department

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

PLAINTIFF,

No. _____

Vs.

DONALD PATRICK ROEMER,

COMPLAINT

☒ FELONY

☐ MISDEMEANOR
(Sect. 17b P.C.)

DEFENDANT.

COUNT I

K. McIlvain

, being first duly sworn, says that

DONALD PATRICK ROEMER

committed the crime of violation of section 288(a) of the Penal Code

a (felony), (XXXXXX), in that on or about January 26, 1981

in Ventura County, California, he did willfully, unlawfully, and lewdly commit a lewd and lascivious act upon and with the body and certain parts and members thereof of REDACTED, a child under the age of fourteen years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, and gratifying the lust, passions, and sexual desires of the said defendant and the said child.

COUNT II

Said complainant further accuses DONALD PATRICK ROEMER of committing the crime of violation of section 288(a) of the Penal Code, a felony, in that on or about January 19, 1981, in Ventura County, California, he did willfully, unlawfully, and lewdly commit a lewd and lascivious act upon and with the body and certain parts and members thereof of REDACTED, a child under the age of fourteen years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, and gratifying the lust, passions, and sexual desires of the said defendant and the said child.

COUNT III

Said complainant further accuses DONALD PATRICK ROEMER of committing the crime of violation of section 288(a) of the Penal Code, a felony, in that on or about January 19, 1981, in Ventura County, California, he did willfully, unlawfully, and lewdly commit a lewd and lascivious act upon and with the body and certain parts and members thereof of REDACTED, a child under the age of fourteen years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, and gratifying the lust, passions, and sexual desires of the said defendant and the said child.

COUNT IV

Said complainant further accuses DONALD PATRICK ROEMER of committing the crime of violation of section 288(a) of the Penal Code, a felony, in that on or about January 12, 1981, in Ventura County, California, he did willfully, unlawfully, and lewdly commit a lewd and lascivious act upon and with the body and certain parts and members thereof of REDACTED, a child under the age of fourteen years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, and gratifying the lust, passions, and sexual desires of the said defendant and the said child.

COUNT V

Said complainant further accuses DONALD PATRICK ROEMER of committing the crime of violation of section 288(a) of the Penal Code, a felony, in that on or about November 29, 1980, in Ventura County, California, he did willfully, unlawfully, and lewdly commit a lewd and lascivious act upon and with the body and certain parts and members thereof of REDACTED, a child under the age of fourteen years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, and gratifying the lust, passions, and sexual desires of the said defendant and the said child.

COUNT VI

Said complainant further accuses DONALD PATRICK ROEMER of committing the crime of violation of section 288(a) of the Penal Code, a felony, in that on and between January 1, 1980 and June 30, 1980, in Ventura County, California, he did willfully, unlawfully, and lewdly commit a lewd and lascivious act upon and with the body and certain parts and members thereof of REDACTED, a child under the age of fourteen years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, and gratifying the lust, passions, and sexual desires of the said defendant and the said child.

COUNT VII

Said complainant further accuses DONALD PATRICK ROEMER of committing the crime of violation of section 647a of the Penal Code, a misdemeanor, in that on and between June 1, 1980 and July 31, 1980, in Ventura County, California, he did willfully and unlawfully annoy and molest a child, REDACTED, under the age of eighteen years.

COUNT VIII

Said complainant further accuses DONALD PATRICK ROEMER of committing the crime of violation of section 647a of the Penal Code, a misdemeanor, in that on or about December 27, 1980, in San Diego County, California, he did willfully and unlawfully annoy and molest a child, REDACTED under the age of eighteen years, and did commit acts and cause effects thereof constituting and requisite to the consummation of the said annoying and molesting in Ventura County.

COUNT IX

Said complainant further accuses DONALD PATRICK ROEMER of committing the crime of violation of section 288(a) of the Penal Code, a felony, in that on or about May 11, 1980, in San Bernardino County, California, he did willfully, unlawfully, and lewdly commit a lewd and lascivious act upon and with the body and certain parts and members thereof of REDACTED, a child under the age of fourteen years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, and gratifying the lust, passions, and sexual desires of the said defendant and the said child, and did commit acts and cause effects thereof constituting and requisite to the consummation of the said lewd and lascivious act in Ventura County.

5596

will recommended by

District Attorney:

OR

/s/ K. McIlvain *hain* #0533

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 29th

day of January, 1981.

/s/ Joseph E. Taylor, Jr.

Deputy District Attorney, Ventura County

Deputy:
Officer:
Location from 197
197

PENAL CODE

(Pen. Code, § 286) having sexual intercourse was sodomy now impeachment of evidence of a sexual act in defendant's case where the evidence at a prior time defendant consented, but on is instead asked if he during the prior act victim, that he get away with it; defendant was never admitted to him, and questions on cross-examination to the jury victim of a prior act successfully depleading consent, could use the same as to paint a sign it," however, the of the clear and the evidence of of the fact that could have viobrook (1974) 43

accomplices

allegedly perpetrated a locked jail cell trial court could be circumstances police and that his sufficient basis are the boy had and had never ified that he was previously enarious homosexhim in the two fendant and his that he would ult if he did not t, and where he ild beat him up anyone. Thus it nsent to the act at bodily harm.

108 Cal Rptr

knowingly, voluntarily unite with the n of the crime. law, means a the possession y to make an g proposed by d 651, 108 Cal

Pen Code]

PENAL CODE

16. In General

In a prosecution of defendant for burglary and other crimes, evidence showing that defendant raped the victim twice, sodomized her and compelled her several times to orally copulate him over two-hour period was insufficient to support the jury's finding that he inflicted "great bodily injury" on the victim within the meaning of Pen. Code, § 461, which prescribes enhanced punish-

ment for the intentional infliction of such injury. Neither forcible rape, sodomy, nor oral copulation can, in and of themselves, constitute great bodily injury for the enhancement of punishment provision of burglary, and neither can the commission of such offenses together, without any additional physical manifestations or consequences, constitute such injury. *People v Caudillo* (1978) 21 C3d 562, 146 Cal Rptr 859, 580 P2d 274.

§ 286.1. [Repealed by Stats 1975 ch 71 § 8.]

See § 286.

§ 286.5. [Sexually assaulting animal]

Any person who sexually assaults any animal protected by Section 597f for the purpose of arousing or gratifying the sexual desire of the person is guilty of a misdemeanor.

Added Stats 1975 ch 71 § 8.5.

21 Cal Jur 3d Criminal Law § 3335.

Review of Selected 1975 Code Legislation. 7 Pacific LJ 366.

§ 287. [Penetration sufficient to complete the crime]

Any sexual penetration, however slight, is sufficient to complete the crime of sodomy.

Amended Stats 1975 ch 71 § 9.

Amendments:

1975 Amendment: Substituted "of sodomy" for "against nature".

Witkin Crimes pp 494, 496.

21 Cal Jur 3d Criminal Law § 2331.

Review of Selected 1975 Code Legislation. 7 Pacific LJ 366.

A state statute prohibiting "crimes against nature" is not unconstitutionally vague for failing to give fair warning to a man convicted under it for forcing a woman to submit to his acts of cunnilingus, where the phrase "crime against nature" had been considered by the courts of some states to encompass acts of cunnilingus, the broad interpretation of "crime against nature" as including forms of sexual aberration beyond those acts constituting the common law offense of sodomy, as opposed to the narrow interpretation of "crime against nature" being limited only to acts constituting sodomy at common law, was not itself uncon-

stitutionally vague, the state's highest court, although not specifically holding that cunnilingus fell within the statute, had given clear notice in its decisions that the statute would receive the broader of two plausible interpretations and would be applied to acts of cunnilingus when such a case arose, and there was no possibility of retroactive lawmaking whereby a criminal statute, narrow and precise on its face, would be expanded by judicial construction to encompass acts clearly outside the scope of the statute as written. *Rose v Locke* (1975) 423 US 48, 46 L Ed 2d 185, 96 S Ct 243.

§ 288. [Crimes against children: Lewd or lascivious acts: Punishment]

(a) Any person who shall willfully and lewdly commit any lewd or lascivious act including any of the acts constituting other crimes provided for in Part 1 of this code upon or with the body, or any part or member thereof, of a child under the age of 14 years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust or passions or sexual desires of such person or of such child, shall be guilty of a felony and shall be imprisoned in the state prison for a term of three, five, or seven years.

[2 Pen Code]

§ 288

§ 647a

CRIMES AND PUNISHMENT

SUGGESTED FORM

Allegation Charging Disorderly Conduct

[For general form of complaint, see form set out under § 740.]

_____, being duly sworn, states on information and belief that the defendant[s] did in the _____ [City of _____, County of _____ or _____ Judicial District, County of _____], State of California, on or about _____, 19____, commit a misdemeanor, to wit: A violation of Section 647, subsec. _____, of the Penal Code of the State of California, in that _____ [he or she or they] _____ [insert one of the following allegations]:

[Subd (a)] _____ did _____ [solicit another to engage or engage] in lewd or dissolute conduct, to wit: _____ in _____ [a public place or a place open to the public or a place exposed to public view], to wit: _____.

[Subd (b)] _____ did _____ [solicit or engage in] an act of prostitution.

[Subd (c)] _____ did accost other persons in _____ [a public place or a place open to the public], to wit: _____, for the purpose of begging or soliciting alms.

[Subd (d)] _____ did loiter in or about a toilet open to the public, to wit: _____, for the purpose of _____ [engaging in or soliciting] a _____ [lewd or lascivious or unlawful] act, to wit: _____.

[Subd (e)] _____ did _____ [loiter or wander] upon _____ [street or other place] without apparent reason or business and refused to identify himself and to account for his presence when requested to do so by a peace officer.

[Subd (f)] _____ was found in a public place, to wit: _____, under the influence of _____ [intoxicating liquor or a drug or toluene or any substance defined as a poison in Schedule D of Section 4160 of the Business and Professions Code or any combination of the foregoing] in such condition _____ [that he was unable to exercise care for his own safety or the safety of others or by reason of his being under the influence of _____ (intoxicating liquor, etc.) _____ (interfered with or obstructed or prevented) the free use of the _____ (street or sidewalk or other public way)].

[Subd (g)] _____ did _____ [loiter or prowl or wander] upon the private property of another, to wit: _____, in the nighttime, without visible or lawful business with the _____ [owner or occupant] thereof.

[Subd (h)] _____ did, while _____ [loitering or prowling or wandering] upon the private property of another, to wit: _____, in the nighttime, peek in the _____ [door or window] of an inhabited _____ [building or structure] located thereon, without visible or lawful business with the _____ [owner or occupant] thereof.

[Subd (i)] _____ did lodge in a _____ [building or structure or other place], to wit: _____, without the permission of _____, the _____ [owner or person entitled to the possession or person in control] thereof.

[For form of allegation charging prior convictions see form set out under § 644.]

§ 647a. [Annoying or molesting children]

Every person who annoys or molests any child under the age of 18 is a vagrant and is punishable upon first conviction by a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars (\$500) or by imprisonment in the county jail for not exceeding six months or by both such fine and imprisonment and is punishable upon the second and each subsequent conviction or upon the first conviction after a previous conviction under Section 288 of this code by imprisonment in the state prison for not less than one year.

CONFIDENTIAL

27 Jan 81

Your Eminence:

On 26 January 1981 Rev. PATRICK ROEMER, was called to the Sherif Station in Thousand Oaks as a result of a complaint of child molestation. According to Father REDACTED he admitted this and added several other incidents.

His hearing will take place this coming Friday. REDACTED is already on the case.

It will be necessary to transfer Father Roemer immediately.

JAR

Nameless accuser

Editor, News Chronicle:

The article on Father Pat Roemer in the Jan. 27 issue was an unsubstantiated character assassination by some nameless, faceless accuser. There was no stated attempt to even get Father Roemer's comments.

The (News) Chronicle, we believe, has done the community and a well-known humanitarian a disservice.

MR. and MRS. RUDY LAUTERBACH,
Thousand Oaks.

Other news enough

Editor, News Chronicle:

Hasn't there been enough factual news of late to occupy your reporters? Surely, with a new president and the return of the hostages to Washington D.C. on Tuesday, your circulation must have been at an all-time high.

Tell me why, News Chronicle, did you have to publish with front-page sensationalism the article about Father Pat Roemer? What purpose did it serve? Allegations stemming from the mouth of a 7-year-old are hardly grounds for tarnishing the reputation of one who has done so much good for

our community and who is loved by so many, Catholics and non-Catholics alike.

Would you have granted the same kind of coverage if the person accused had been a layman and not so well known? I think not.

World Book Dictionary gives as synonyms for the word "scandal" the three words "discredit, disrepute, dishonor." You have made an honest effort to bring all three to Father Roemer and, in doing so, have firmly established yourself as our neighborhood scandal sheet.

BRENDA YOUNG,
Thousand Oaks.

Charges are wrong

Editor, News Chronicle:

I'm a high school sophomore and I have known Father Roemer since the beginning of the eighth grade.

Is it that wrong to show a little affection toward a child? Come on! Anybody who knows Father Roemer will say these charges are wrong (News Chronicle, Jan. 27).

He is the only person I know in Thousand Oaks that does these things for kids. Practically every kid in St. Paschal's has went out with Father Roemer.

He has taken me out many, many times and he has never done anything wrong. He tries to do so many things for kids. When I needed a job, he got me one, when my brother or I played sports or any other kid played sports, he watched us, and (he) is even my godfather.

I would just like to say that my whole family loves him and I know I could say that a lot of other families do too. These accusations make me very upset. So people who believe the same way I do — write up.

PAT POWERS and FAMILY,
Thousand Oaks.

Why not wait?

Editor, News Chronicle:

Re: Article that appeared Tuesday, Jan. 27 regarding Father Pat Roemer.

I'm really very upset about your article concerning Father Pat Roemer. Do you realize how much that man is admired and loved by so many children and adults? If you did, you wouldn't have been so quick to write what you did.

First of all, a man is innocent until proven guilty, right? This being the case, why the hell couldn't you wait to see the outcome of the hearing in court before you even printed this story? If you had to print it at all!

Aren't there enough newsworthy stories these days?

DIANE GODFREY,
Thousand Oaks.

Lest we forget

Editor, News Chronicle:

We think that the article concerning Father Pat Roemer came across as speculative and opinionated. As parishioners of his church and personal friends of his we have found that his conduct is more than acceptable in his extensive work with children in many areas such as AYSO, Boy Scouts and

many other children's organizations. It seems to us that you forget that in the United States a man is innocent until proven guilty.

BILL BUSH,
DAN BUSH,
Thousand Oaks.

They are really close

Editor, News Chronicle:

I'm 10 years old and I've known Father Roemer for all of my life. We are really

close and I love him very much.

ANDREW WHITEHOUSE,
Thousand Oaks.

Always there when needed

Editor, News Chronicle:

I'm very sorry to see the article you wrote about Father Pat Roemer. I've known him for 10 years. He is one of the best friends I have ever had and is always there when I need him. I think it was a disgrace the way

you put him down in your paper. I personally think that he has done more than any other man for the youth in the Conejo Valley.

TIM WHITEHOUSE,
Thousand Oaks.

Too good of a guy

Editor, News Chronicle:

My mom and dad told me about the article in the Tuesday Jan. 27 News Chronicle on Father Roemer. I go to St. Paschal's Church and I attend CCD (Confraternity of Christian Doctrine) classes twice a week. I know he wouldn't do a thing like that, he wouldn't. I know he's too good of a guy, like

once he took me and some other boys to see a movie and after CCD class he's there to greet us. He's a really nice guy and I support him all the way.

BRYAN MARTIN,
Age 11,
Thousand Oaks.

Means so much

Editor, News Chronicle:

The article that was printed in your paper, Page 1, Jan. 27, concerning Father Donald Patrick Roemer was a total outrage! Your article has proven him guilty before his court date. This man means so much to our own family, not to mention the entire congregation of St. Paschal's. If this man is cleared, he will carry the shadow you cast over his life to his grave, and all because the News Chronicle likes to sensationalize at all costs. He has given his life to God and his congregation and you slipped it right from under him.

If anyone quotes anything from your paper without other proof, I would never believe them and I would tell them why. The News Chronicle loves to sensationalize.

JOYCE ZAR,
Thousand Oaks.

Children hurt

Editor, News Chronicle:

Regarding your article about Father Roemer on Jan. 27.

I was shocked and mad after reading your article about Father Roemer. As a concerned parent I condemn anything that would hurt the mental and physical well-being of our children. Do you realize how many children you have hurt by printing such a story? Granted, you don't know him, but to print such a story before the man has been found guilty is a grave injustice.

I would like to ask the parents of the child in this case as members of the parish, why didn't you contact the parish itself? Don't you trust the church you attend?

Father Roemer has achieved what parents and educators work for — the love of our children and I hate to see this crumble because of a probable misunderstanding.

Father Roemer, Melissa and Michael send you their love; they want you back soon!

MARY L. BORAU,
Thousand Oaks.

Close friend

Editor, News Chronicle:

I am a close friend to Father Pat. He taught me how to be an altar boy. Don't you think he feels pretty bad right now? But putting it in the newspaper (is) pretty outright stupid; he feels embarrassed enough without putting it in the paper when the person has earned up nicknames as "Incredible Father Hulk," or "Bionic Priest" or "Super Priest," or "Mini Priest."

The printing of stories should be brought in more consideration. The first story's bad enough but to print another one (pretty stupid, huh?)

P.S. Come back to Redwood (Intermediate School) soon.

CHRIS HEIMLER,
Thousand Oaks.

State of shock

Editor, News Chronicle:

I am certain those of us who are a part of the Catholic community here in Thousand Oaks are in a state of shock concerning the accusations brought against our Father Roemer, of St. Paschal's. At this point in time, all we can do is wait to hear the evidence and the verdict as to whether Father is guilty or innocent. Knowing Father as we do, we would rather believe he is innocent and pray our beliefs are correct.

I am horribly angry over this entire incident, but my anger for the moment is directed strictly at the News Chronicle and the reporter who took it upon herself to

smear the name of a very loving man before he was declared guilty or innocent. The damage has been done now, Faye Fiore, and God willing, if Father is declared innocent I would not want what you have done on my conscience.

I ask you, News Chronicle, and Fiore, why did you not take it upon yourself to print the name of the 7-year-old and his parents and the friends of the parents who involved themselves in this horrid story? You tell me the difference and what gives you the right to smear the name of a man of God and not the name of a 7-year-old, and don't give me that song and dance because the child is a minor and it is for his own protection. What about someone protecting Father Roemer? I find this act you have committed abominable, deplorable and abusive to the entire Catholic community and the administrators of St. Paschal's. God help your miserable souls and God help us all in the future if this is the kind of prejudging we are all destined to be exposed to in this community by the news media.

I now direct the next question to the parents of the child in question. Why did you not go directly to the church administrators with your accusations? It was a low, cheap shot to involve any outsider until you took it up with church authorities. You allowed your friends to make Father Roemer the center ring of a three-ring circus. God help us all if this is what we have to contend with in today's society. Leave it to the news media to get our blood boiling. I suggest, Fiore, the next time you jump the gun to get a sensational story, you call upon your own God and conscience to guide your every step.

MRS. FRANCINE JUSTICE SHERMAN
and FAMILY,
Thousand Oaks.

Wrong reasons

Editor, News Chronicle:

Is there room for one more letter concerning the Father Roemer case? It seems that many people are getting hot for what appears to me the wrong reasons.

1. To imply that an accusation from a 7-year-old has little credibility because of his youthful age is terribly unjust. I find this an odd and embarrassing kind of a story for a child to be making up. More children should be given a responsive but still discerning ear.

2. Perhaps this "checking with a friend" about the child's story was in an effort to be fair to Father Roemer, so as not to take such an accusation lightly.

3. I also ask, what makes a man of the cloth exempt from emotional disturbances? It has happened before. Does this mean that any person holding a position of influence and respect should automatically be free from suspicion?

4. And to say that any person has an inability to be immoral sounds quite presumptuous to me. The only person I can think of who could claim that virtue is Jesus. We are all struggling with our human desires to some degree or another.

5. I am not saying this man is guilty. I have no way of knowing. And I am not refuting those who believe him to be a fine man. But the danger in blindly discounting a serious accusation disturbs me greatly. It is important that every claim of this sort is thoroughly investigated to protect the innocent.

6. The major fault here, I think, is of the newspaper's handling and coverage of this matter. Since a man's reputation and career could be irrevocably damaged, as in this case, can't the paper wait to report until after it has been determined whether the man is innocent or guilty?

MRS. KATHY AUSTEN,
Thousand Oaks.

Second father

Editor, News Chronicle:

I am 13 years old and I'm in junior high. I've known Father Pat since fifth grade. I, as well as my brothers, ages 12 and 8, have spent many hours and days alone with Father Pat and I think it's wrong what people are doing to him. He's almost like a second father to me and I love him very much. I know he wouldn't do such a thing like he's accused of to anyone. Sure he hugs me and I love him because he is just showing me how much he loves me. I play tennis with him and he takes me to many different places.

I just want to say that a lot of people are behind Father Pat and we all love him very much.

JOHN RODRIGUEZ and FAMILY,
Thousand Oaks.

In third place

Editor, News Chronicle:

I am 14 years old and my sister is 12 years old. Ever since I knew Father Pat, he has never made any of those things a little 7-year-old boy stated to the police and you (News Chronicle) to me or to my sister. He has taken a lot of my friends and myself to different places all over. Last year he took all the eighth-graders on a retreat to Malibu before our Confirmation. He works with all children all the time and my sister says he goes through all the CCD (Confraternity of Christine Doctrine) classes and says hello.

I thought that printing that article on the front page was really low-class. As one lady said in the letters to the editor on Jan. 30, that this paper was a scandal sheet on her street and I have to agree with her on that because everybody at school and along the streets talk about this article. This paper was first on my list of papers but now it is third out of only two papers.

All my friends agree with me saying we are behind you 100 percent, Father Pat. We all know you are not guilty and we hope the district attorney of Ventura County will notice it, too.

We love you, Father Pat!
SCOTT MCINTYRE,
Thousand Oaks.

Will rebuild life

Editor, News Chronicle:

I cannot believe that article about Father Pat Roemer in the News Chronicle on Jan. 27. Your article is totally untrue and I really do not believe it in my heart. I think you have ruined Father Pat's relationship with the little kids but I hope that he will still have the contact with kids he once had. Knowing Father Pat, he will rebuild his life and I will always love him, no matter what and so will everyone else. He is someone everyone can talk to and we know that he can help us with our problems and understand us too.

Father Roemer is great and he loves all of us kids here at St. Paschal's school and all kids he comes in contact with. I am really sorry for the parents of the 7-year-old boy for they don't understand the true meaning of love with respect and dignity.

I would just like to say that we back Father Pat and everyone loves you, Father. Please come back to St. Paschal's parish because we love you and need you.

MATTHEW WESTENDORF,
Thousand Oaks.

Arraignment set Friday

Priest faces molestation count

News Jan 29-81

Arraignment is scheduled Friday in Ventura Municipal Court for a Thousand Oaks Catholic priest, who was arrested on suspicion of child molestation.

Sgt. Daniel Coons of the East Valley Sheriff's Station said the Rev. Donald P. Roemer, 36, of St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church, was booked Monday on a complaint made by a 7-year-old boy.

Roemer was released on his own recognizance pending his arraignment.

Church officials refused comment on the incident.

William Sugars, chairman of the Conejo Valley Chapter of SIAM, the statewide organization of Concerned Citizens for Stronger Legislation Against Child Molesters, said he planned to follow the case closely.

Local Calendar

Mystic lecture

A program will in- about the can- services.

The New Life Foundation will sponsor a lecture titled "Discover Real Sexuality" at 4 p.m. Saturday at Southern California Savings, 996 S. Seaward. Ventura, Guy Finley will lead the discussion based on the practical teaching of mystic and inner-development teacher Vernon Howard.

Swimmers sought

Conejo Recreation and Park District

Friday, in the campus career center.

Friday, in the campus career center.

Friday, in the campus career center.

College orientation

Incoming Ventura College students are invited to attend a special orientation session to be held at 8 a.m., 10 a.m., 1 p.m. and 6 p.m. weekdays until Friday, in the campus career center.

Inmate's families

Bus transportation is provided by the Help Public Service Foundation Inc. for persons wishing to visit members of their family incarcerated in California Department of Corrections facilities. A trip is scheduled for Sunday to San Luis Obispo. Call Samuel Thus at the foundation's headquarters in Angeles, phone for information now being sent to follow the case closely.

Jan. 29, 1981
Dear Cardinal Manning,

I am writing this in support of my parish priest, a friend and a colleague, Fr. Pat Roemer. I would just like to express my love and appreciation for this man, be he found innocent or guilty. I know that child molesting is a sickness, a weakness, and I would want him to find the help he would need, but I would still not hesitate to trust him with my own children. He has been at my house often - my children love him, as do my husband and myself, and he is always and will be always welcome here.

● I would really like to see him stay in the community, if possible, and fight his way back from here, if parish support was behind him. I feel it's going to be difficult for him anywhere and I think the whole community could really rally round this man and show a true christian spirit and brotherhood.

When things seemed dark, I realized his innocence or guilt didn't matter to me - I would love him anyway and support him. That seemed to me, Christ's true message, unconditional love. Please let him stay, if possible. Thank you,

REDACTED

5925

REDACTED
Mr. & Mrs.
REDACTED
REDACTED

5926

1/29/31

Community stunned by report of priest's arrest

By FAYE FIORE

Comparing him to a "sacrificial lamb" who is being "hung and crucified" before his trial, several local residents expressed shock and anger about the arrest of a Conejo parish priest on charges of child molesting.

The News Chronicle has received a flood of phone calls after reporting Tuesday that the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer, 36, was booked Monday night at the East Valley Sheriff's Station on a single count of child molesting.

Callers have angrily criticized the newspaper for publishing the report of the arrest, saying publicity should have been withheld until after Roemer is tried.

Roemer is accused of "making advances of a sexual nature" toward a 7-year-old boy who attends Bible study classes at St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church in Thousand Oaks, sheriff's deputies said.

The News Chronicle routinely publishes reports of such arrests.

Roemer is scheduled to appear at 8:30 a.m. Friday in Ventura Municipal Court Division 11 to enter a plea.

The child's parents told deputies that their son began to describe at the dinner table an alleged encounter with Roemer. Sheriff's detectives investigated the situation and determined there were grounds to arrest the clergyman, who has been a priest for 10 years.

Roemer has been publicly commended for his patient work with children during his few years in the local parish, and disbelieving parents are stepping forward in his defense.

"Our priests are constant targets," said Penny Lord, a parishioner at St. Jude's Catholic Church in Thousand Oaks. "All priests are like sacrificial lambs," who are vulnerable to accusations, she said after calling the News Chronicle.

Lord related overhearing people at St. Jude's parish praying for Roemer, who has come to be known as "Father Pat" in the community.

"The people at the church are hurt because they know him and they love him and they want to be sure he's going to be given a fair trial," she said.

Darts of criticism have also been aimed at the sheriff's department, which callers say overreacted to the "remarks of a 7-year-old."

Detectives are caught precariously between justifying the arrest to the public and suppressing important evidence that must be saved for court.

Contacted by the News Chronicle this morning, East Valley Commander Larry Kalsbeek reinforced his earlier comments that the arrest was not made on a whim.

"Obviously, you do not build a case around only one statement by a 7-year-old," Kalsbeek said. "We did conduct further investigation and for those who have concluded that the arrest did not have sufficient

cause, they should hold their comments until the preliminary examination where evidence can be made public in court. But we are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence for arrest and prosecution."

Members of the parish insist that even if Roemer is found innocent in court, his reputation and work in the community will be permanently soiled by the allegations.

"This ruined the man," said Bud Sweeney, a St. Paschal's parishioner who accused the News Chronicle of poor judgment in publishing the article. "There's a lot of bad that could be caused by this,



REV. DONALD
PATRICK ROEMER

especially because this man has been working with children for years.

"It's taking from him the very thing he stood for all his life. He's being hung and crucified before his trial. It must be tearing this man apart."

Emotions are undoubtedly running even higher because Roemer has reached out to so many children in the community, prompting the Parent Teachers Association to award him its 1980 Honorary Service Award for his work with Conejo youth.

A News Chronicle article published last April described the clergyman's candidness and sense of humor with the children, as well as his philosophy of "being there" for those who need him.

"For people, or for kids, that's what it's all about," he was quoted as saying.

Bill Sugars, president of the Conejo Valley chapter of Concerned Parents for Stronger Legislation Against Child Molesters (SLAM) said he, too, has been reproved for his comments about the arrest.

The community uproar is hasty, he said, because the public has seen none of the evidence gathered by detectives.

"I would prefer that the community wait until the arraignment is over until they pass any judgment on anybody — whether it's SLAM, the sheriff's department, members of the church or parents.

"I think the community is blindly rushing to the aid of this man," he said. "A show of support is expected, but to make accusations about something they know nothing about is foolish."

Sheriff's detectives are continuing to investigate the case before they take it to the Ventura County district attorney's office, where it will be reviewed for possible prosecution.

Chronicle

rnia

Friday, January 30, 1981

20 cents

48 pages



with his attorney J.J. Brandlin at the
the priest pleaded innocent to a charge of

Conejo priest denies guilt in molest case

By FAYE FIORE

Father Donald Patrick Roemer this morning pleaded innocent to a charge that he sexually molested a youngster who attended Bible study classes at his Thousand Oaks church.

There are nine counts included in the complaint filed by the Ventura district attorney's office this morning, officials there said.

The priest, flanked by a handful of supporters, squinted sharply at the stark light of a television camera waiting for him as he walked out of the doors of the Ventura municipal courtroom after his arraignment.

The formal charge was filed by the Ventura County district attorney's office this morning after prosecutors reviewed evidence collected by Conejo sheriff's deputies. Detectives have been investigating the case since the 36-year-old St. Paschal Baylon parish priest was arrested Monday night.

Emotions which exploded in the community after the report of his arrest were heightened at today's arraignment as local parishioners huddled around the priest to protect him from the camera and reporters.

"Why are you doing this to him?" one woman yelled.

"Why not? They did it to Jesus," another responded bitterly.

The priest, renowned locally for his work with children, was booked after the parents of a 7-year-old Thousand Oaks boy reported that Roemer allegedly molested the youngster. Sheriff's deputies who investigated the complaint say they found enough additional evidence to warrant an arrest and prosecution, although they will not disclose the facts of the case.

Neither Roemer nor his Los Angeles attorney, J.J. Brandlin, would comment on the matter.

Roemer did respond, however, to the shower of support he has received from churchgoers who are appalled by the arrest and disgusted by the media coverage.

"I am tremendously grateful," the small, red-haired priest said softly as he waited to enter his plea.

Municipal Court Judge Edwin M. Osborne ordered Roemer to appear for a preliminary hearing at 1:30 p.m. Feb. 19 in Division 12 of the municipal court where Deputy District Attorney Joe Taylor said he expects to present about a half-day of testimony.

A judge will then decide if there is enough evidence to order the clergyman to stand trial.

The swift arraignment lasted less than five minutes, but the uproar outside the courtroom yielded to a lengthy flood of conflicting comments.

"My question is why don't they publish the name of the accuser?" Penny Lord, a St. Jude's Catholic Church parishioner and a friend of the clergyman, said.

Sheriff's department policy prohibits deputies from releasing the name of the victim of an alleged sexual crime or the name of the family when the victim is a minor.

"We've heard of cases where children lie; it happens all the time," Lord said.

The readiness of church members to discount the 7-year-old's complaint disturbed Jessie Kloppenburg, national president of Concerned Parents for Stronger Legislation Against Child Molesters (SLAM).

"I wonder why adults find it so hard to believe children," she said outside the courtroom.

"This problem exists in every walk of life. It is not limited to any profession. It crosses all boundaries, whether they be political or racial or whatever," Kloppenburg said, adding that she will follow the case through the court process.

"People sometimes believe that if a person is a man of God, he is above all of this . . . I have compassion for him and I know he has feelings, but I still have feelings for children, too."

Roemer has been honored for his active work with Conejo youth and parishioners today complained that his arrest is an affront to his good deeds.

"The very same people who arrested him are the ones who would call him in the middle of the night to ask his help with a teen-ager," Bob Lord complained.

The priest's supporters complained of biased coverage "which has never told Father Roemer's side"; the press has met with repeated responses of "no comment" from the church, Roemer and his attorney.

An 8:30 a.m. Mass at St. Paschal's coincided with Roemer's appearance in court; observers said the church was crowded with parishioners who evidently turned out to pray for him.



Jessie Kloppenburg, national president of Concerned Parents for Stronger Legislation Against Child Molesters, attended today's hearing. (News Chronicle photo)

Conejo priest charged with child molesting

By FAYE FIORE

A Conejo parish priest was charged Monday with one count of child molesting after he allegedly "made advances" toward a 7-year-old Thousand Oaks boy.

Father Donald Patrick Roemer, 36, was arrested at 3:30 p.m. at St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church, 155 E. Janss Road, and booked at East Valley Sheriff's Station, Detective Sgt. Andy Vasquez said today.

Deputies were tight-lipped about the incident this morning, saying only that the youngster told his parents the priest made "advances of a sexual nature toward him."

The child was attending a catechism class at the church, in which children are taught about the Catholic faith, authorities said.

A member of the parish told the News Chronicle that the boy was eating dinner with his parents when he began to describe an incident with Roemer.

"The parents are friends of ours and they called me, wondering what to do," the parishioner, who asked not to be identified,

(See PRIEST, Page 3)

said. "Father Roemer has worked with their child and ours, too."

The youngster's parents contacted sheriff's deputies and Roemer was arrested after an investigation by detectives.

"It's very important that people know about this kind of thing because, hopefully, it will bring other people forward," Bill Sugars, president of the Conejo chapter of Concerned Citizens for Stronger Legislation Against Child Molesters (SLAM), said.

"Especially in a position of trust like this, he should not be allowed to work with children ever again if he is guilty of what he's charged with."

Father Colm O'Ryan, co-administrator of the parish, refused to comment on the arrest this morning.

Members of the church said the priest works extensively with children and has been at St. Paschal's for about three or four years.

Those contacted were shocked to learn of

the arrest. "He's such a neat guy," one woman said.

Roemer was released from the sheriff's station on his promise to appear in Ventura County Municipal Court Thursday at 8:30 a.m.

Authorities are in the process of filing the charges with the Ventura County district attorney's office.

If an arraignment is conducted Thursday, Roemer will enter his plea to the charges.

newschronicle

Vol. XXVI — No. 209

Thousand Oaks, California

Friday, January 30, 1981

20 cents

48 pages

Conejo priest denies guilt in molest case

By FAYE FIORE

Father Donald Patrick Roemer this morning pled innocent to a charge that he sexually molested a youngster who attended Bible study classes at his Thousand Oaks church.

There are nine counts included in the complaint filed by the Ventura district attorney's office this morning, officials there said.

The priest, flanked by a handful of supporters, squinted sharply at the stark light of a television camera waiting in the lobby of a courtroom as he walked out of the courtroom after his arraignment. The criminal charge was filed by the Ventura County district attorney's office this morning after prosecutors reviewed evidence collected by Conejo sheriff's deputies. Detectives have been investigating the case since the 36-year-old St. Paschal Baylon parish priest was arrested Monday night.

Emotions which exploded in the community after the report of his arrest were heightened at today's arraignment as about 20 parishioners huddled around the priest to protect him from the cameras and reporters. "Why are you doing this to him?" one woman yelled.

"Why not? They did it to Jesus," another responded bitterly. "I'm lonely for his work." The priest, robed and heavily for his work with children, was looked after the parents of a 12-year-old Thousand Oaks boy reported to be a Roemer allegedly molested the youngster. Sheriff's deputies who investigated the complaint say they found enough additional evidence to warrant an arrest and prosecution, although they will not disclose the facts of the case.

Neither Roemer nor his Los Angeles attorney, J.J. Bragglin, would comment on the matter.

Roemer did respond, however, to the shower of support he has received from churchgoers who are appalled at the arrest and charged by "shockingly brutal," the small, red-haired priest said softly as he walked to enter his plea.

Municipal Court Judge Edwin M. Osborne ordered Roemer to appear for a preliminary hearing at 1:30 p.m. Feb. 19 in Division 12 of the municipal court where Deputy District Attorney Joe Taylor said he expects to present about a half-day of testimony.

A judge will then decide if there is enough evidence to order the clergyman to stand trial.

"We've heard of cases where children lie; it happens all the time," Lord said.

The readiness of church members to discount the 7-year-old's complaint disturbed Jessie Klippenburg, national president of Concerned Parents for Stronger Legislation Against Child Molesters (SLAM). "I wonder why adults find it so hard to believe children," she said outside the courtroom.

This is a problem which arises in every walk of life. It is limited to any profession. It crosses all boundaries, whether they be political or racial or whatever," Klippenburg said, adding that she will follow the case through the court process.

"People sometimes believe that if a person is a man of God, he is above all of this. . . I have compassion for him and I know he has feelings, but I still have feelings for children, too."

Roemer has been honored for his active work with Conejo youth and parishioners by a local youth group. His arrest is an affront to his good name, he said.

"I'm not the same person who arrested him are the ones who would call him in the middle of the night to ask his help with a teenager," Bob Lord complained. The priest's supporters complained of biased coverage "which has never told Father Roemer's side," the press has met with repeated responses of "no comment" from the church, Roemer and his attorney. An 8:30 a.m. Mass at St. Paschal's coincided with Roemer's appearance in court. Observers said the church was crowded out to parishioners who evidently turned out to pray for him.

Waiting

The Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer, left, takes a moment alone Ventura Municipal Courthouse. A few minutes later, the Conejo could molesting. (News Chronicle photo by Randy Panch)



T.O. priest arraigned in molestations

Page 3/8

By MARJORIE SCOTT

San Jose Staff Writer

The Ventura County district attorney Friday filed a misdemeanor complaint of child molestations against the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer, 36, a priest at St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church in Thousand Oaks.

Roemer was arrested here Monday night at the church, 156 E. Janus Road, booked at the Ventura County Sheriff's Department East Valley Station and released on his own recognizance.

The priest was arraigned Friday morning in Ventura County

Superior Court Judge Robert J. Brinkley, 350 S. Van Ness Ave., San Jose.

The priest was arraigned on a misdemeanor complaint of child molestations, filed by the district attorney, 300 S. Van Ness Ave., San Jose.

Roemer was arraigned on a misdemeanor complaint of child molestations, filed by the district attorney, 300 S. Van Ness Ave., San Jose.

The priest was arraigned on a misdemeanor complaint of child molestations, filed by the district attorney, 300 S. Van Ness Ave., San Jose.

The priest was arraigned on a misdemeanor complaint of child molestations, filed by the district attorney, 300 S. Van Ness Ave., San Jose.

Roemer was arraigned on a misdemeanor complaint of child molestations, filed by the district attorney, 300 S. Van Ness Ave., San Jose.

The priest was arraigned on a misdemeanor complaint of child molestations, filed by the district attorney, 300 S. Van Ness Ave., San Jose.

Roemer was arraigned on a misdemeanor complaint of child molestations, filed by the district attorney, 300 S. Van Ness Ave., San Jose.

Roemer was arraigned on a misdemeanor complaint of child molestations, filed by the district attorney, 300 S. Van Ness Ave., San Jose.

The priest was arraigned on a misdemeanor complaint of child molestations, filed by the district attorney, 300 S. Van Ness Ave., San Jose.

Roemer was arraigned on a misdemeanor complaint of child molestations, filed by the district attorney, 300 S. Van Ness Ave., San Jose.

The priest was arraigned on a misdemeanor complaint of child molestations, filed by the district attorney, 300 S. Van Ness Ave., San Jose.

Roemer was arraigned on a misdemeanor complaint of child molestations, filed by the district attorney, 300 S. Van Ness Ave., San Jose.

The priest was arraigned on a misdemeanor complaint of child molestations, filed by the district attorney, 300 S. Van Ness Ave., San Jose.

Roemer was arraigned on a misdemeanor complaint of child molestations, filed by the district attorney, 300 S. Van Ness Ave., San Jose.

The priest was arraigned on a misdemeanor complaint of child molestations, filed by the district attorney, 300 S. Van Ness Ave., San Jose.

T.O. priest arraigned in molestations

Jan. 31-81

BY MARJORIE SCOTT

Daily News Staff Writer

The Ventura County district attorney Friday filed a nine-count complaint of child molestation against the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer, 36, a priest at St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church in Thousand Oaks.

Roemer was arrested late Monday night at the church, 155 E. Janss Road, booked at the Ventura County Sheriff's Department East Valley Station and released on his own recognizance.

The priest was arraigned Friday morning in Ventura County

Municipal Court before Judge Edwin M. Osborne and again released on his own recognizance.

The case is scheduled for a preliminary hearing at 1:30 p.m. on Feb. 19 in Division 12 of the Municipal Court in the Hall of Justice at the Ventura County Government Center, 800 S. Victoria Ave., Ventura.

Deputy District Attorney Joseph Taylor said in the complaint Roemer is charged with seven counts of child molestation and two counts of misdemeanor child molestation. The charges involve boys aged 7 to 13.

The charges were filed over incidents alleged to have occurred between May 1980 and Jan. 26, and name nine separate victims, Taylor said. The complaints include two counts involving acts in other counties, one in San Diego and one in San Bernardino, he added.

"All we're releasing at this time is basically the information on the complaints itself, because of the sensitive nature of the case and of Roemer's position in the community," said Robert Bradley, chief deputy district attorney for Ventura County. "We feel not discussing the is-

ssues of the case with anyone will ensure a fair trial," Bradley said. "There's some real concern in this case, more than in other child molest cases, of the ramifications on the victims in school and in church if others know who they are. Their families are concerned," he added.

Roemer was arrested by deputies Monday on suspicion of child molestation after a 7-year-old boy said the priest made sexual advances toward him, reported Sgt. Daniel Coons of the East Valley Sheriff's Station. Coons said Thousand Oaks police responded to a call that af-

ternoon at St. Paschal's to check on a possible child molestation.

Church officials have declined to comment on the particulars of the case. On Tuesday, The Rev. Colin O'Bryan, co-administrator of St. Paschal's, said neither he nor anyone else at the church would have any comment on Roemer.

Contacted by telephone after the arraignment Thursday, The Rev. Thomas A. Greaney, church pastor, said, "Everything has been dropped."

When told that nine counts of

Please turn to page 10, col. 1

From page 1

child molestation had been filed against Roemer by the District

Although's Office in the court. Greene admitted Roemer was in charge of St. Paschal's sessions. Greene said, "I have heard nothing about youth inquiring out when asked that information."

with the church, Greaney declined to answer. "It doesn't matter now. It's all cleared up, so forget it now," he said.

PTA cites 2 for youth work

By KAREN HIBDON

For ongoing services to the youth of The Conejo, two Conejo residents were honored Wednesday evening by the Conejo Council of Parent Teacher Associations.

The Rev. Donald Roemer, affectionately known as "Father Pat," was presented with the PTA Honorary Service Award, with Dee Joerger receiving the Continuing Service Award.

Plans for the presentations were kept secret until Wednesday's ceremony, hosted by Wildwood Elementary School, one of 12 schools in the Conejo Council of PTAs. Nominees for the councilwide award were solicited from all aspects of the community, including sporting groups, and other civic and youth-oriented clubs and organizations, said Jackie Friedman, current council president.

The winners were selected by a committee of individuals representing each of the schools in the council.

Before a gathering of some 140 persons, Joerger expounded on the attributes of Roemer, who works with youths to help them earn special scouting badges and with young people who have court problems or who are on probation. He leads a weekly church group for teen-agers, offers a children's mass once a month, and invites the children to come and sit on the altar steps during services at St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church, where he is one of the parish priests.

Before presenting the priest with the award, Joerger noted that "Father Pat" is a product of Ventura County, having attended Santa Clara High School in Oxnard and graduating from St. John's Seminary in Camarillo.

"He spends a lot of time at Camarillo State Hospital with the young people there and does a lot to promote youth sports. He has set up softball and baseball leagues at St. Paschal's and shows up at Little League, AYSO soccer and Bobby Sox games — for no particular reason but to show support. He also serves as a noon duty aide on public school campuses that invite him.

And he doesn't have to call the children — they flock to him," Joerger said. The Honorary Service Award is presented annually; to receive the Continuing Service Award, the recipient must have already achieved Honorary status. Joerger was presented with the continuing service award for her unending service to young people in The Conejo. The

wife of Bill Joerger and mother of three children — 14, 16, and 18 years of age — Joerger "has been a parent volunteer throughout the area for the 12 years she's lived here," explained Irene King, who presented the surprise award.

Joerger served as PTA president at Meadows Elementary School for two years and as president of the Los Cerritos Intermediate School Parent-Teacher-Student Association. She served as president of the Conejo Council of PTAs for two years, worked on various school district committees and toward the passage of school bonds in the district. She has held various offices within the PTA organization at all levels.

Joerger has been active in the St. Paschal Baylon Confraternity of Christian Doctrine program, and has coached Bobby Sox teams for years. She is currently second vice president of the Conejo Council and was chairman of the 1980 awards ceremony.

In addition to the two top council awards, the Conejo Council gave special recognition to those selected this year as Honorary or Continuing Service Award winners



Dee Joerger, left, and the Rev. Donald Roemer were honored Wednesday night by the Conejo Council of PTAs. Joerger is receiving the Honorary Service Award, while Roemer is receiving the Continuing Service Award. (News Chronicle photo by Gary Smoot)

at their individual schools. They are:

- Colina Intermediate — Carolina Maslen, honorary;
- Tyler Clark, honorary; Carolyn Elsendach, honorary.
- Conejo Elementary — Jocque Johndro, honorary.
- Glenwood Elementary — Tom Dishno, honorary; Diane McKanna, honorary; Pat Cook, honorary.
- Horizon Hills Elementary — Tina Longenecker, honorary; Raymond Hebel, continuing.
- Ladera Elementary — Gay Hamby, honorary.
- Los Cerritos Intermediate — D. Kent Ashworth,

honorary; Doris DaKroob, honorary; George Cilley, honorary.

- Meadows Elementary — Jean Phillips, honorary; Dave Long, honorary.
- Thousand Oaks High — Ron Barney, honorary.
- Triunfo Elementary — Geraldine Bielcik, honorary.
- Waverly Elementary — Dave Tuttle, honorary.
- Weathersfield Elementary — Sylvia Fox, honorary; James Gordon, honorary.
- Wildwood Elementary — Robert Sisco, Nancy Sisco and Paralee Dooley, all honorary.

ROEMER, Rev. Donald P.

May 23, 1970

<u>Date</u>	<u>Place</u>	<u>Assignment</u>
6/6/70	St. Raphael, Goleta	Assistant
6-17-74	San Roque, Santa Barbara	Associate
12-17-75	Santa Barbara Juvenile Hall	Chaplain
8-15-76	Special Ministry - Part Time Coordinator	
	Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Santa Barbara	
4-11-77	Special Ministry - Los Prietos Boys Camp, Santa Barbara	Chaplain
6/19/78	St. Paschal Baylon, Thous, Oaks	Associate
2/1/81	SICK LEAVE	

64

As a matter of policy
Archdiocese does not give out
addresses.

If you wish to write you can
do so put in a sealed
envelope & send that
to us & we will try to forward
it. Any address we might have
would be a very old one
but we would try to forward it.
for you.

6831

no news there. Nothing you can do to help that.

I believe, however, that if you accept my encouragement, and go after those guys who are cutting into our income, whittling away at our standard of living, carving up our hillsides, and choking our industries with regulations and bureaucracy — and do it with the same journalistic technology recently exhibited — you will shape up this city and this state like no other prize-winning newspaper has ever dreamed of doing. I am confident that all of my Conejo friends would join me in welcoming such an effort.

P.S. Please send me your rates for a lifetime subscription.

JULIUS C. "PAT" DARDEN,
Thousand Oaks.

Show compassion

Editor, News Chronicle:

I am a 1½-year resident of this community here from the East. For a "hometown" newspaper you take great efforts to follow the line of big city papers — your camera crews are ever on hand to flash the cruel results of an accident or of a youthful victim of overdose. I'm not surprised, therefore, to see your crucifixion of a priest who has given more of himself to the children of this community than you could roll papers off the press. The quote of the leader of S.L.A.M., giving judgment before a court hearing, shows lack of journalistic fairness and class.

Clean up your act, News Chronicle, and show human compassion and dignity to the people of this town or are you competing with the National Enquirer?

ANN SADOWSKI,
Thousand Oaks.

Doesn't equate

Editor, News Chronicle:

I grew up in an environment of loving and touching affection as are my son and daughter growing up now. I learned early that hugs, kisses and loving touches are things you get just because you're loved. They are not just rewards for good behavior, but wordless communications of love. These expressions and feelings were shown to me by many people, not just by my parents, but by teachers, clergymen, friends and even once by a stranger who found me when I was lost, alone and scared. That anyone could mistake these actions for sexual advancements frightens me beyond expression. What a sorry state this society is in when people equate love and sex. When teachers, clergymen and even strangers are forbidden to touch children in a sincerely loving and caring way, then something is wrong.

Any highly publicized accusation of the type that was brought against Father Roemer (News Chronicle, Jan. 27) or anyone with as high a standing in the community as he has, is an automatic condemnation. Regardless of his innocence he will be forever scarred by this. And for this paper to sensationalize it as it has is an unforgivable act of cruelty. Myself and my family abhor the act of child molestation and agree that it must be stopped; but to try, convict and sentence a man without due process of the law, as you did by the writing of that article, is also abhorrent.

Our prayers are with you, Father Roemer, for we love you and trust you. Our prayers are also with the little boy whose parents find something ugly and sinful in sincere and unconditional love.

SHERRY, DOUG and CAROL PIUSER,
Newbury Park.

One-sided views

Editor, News Chronicle:

I have lived in the Conejo Valley off and on for the last 20 years. I have found the News Chronicle to be informative on both local and world issues. However, an article which appeared in your paper on Tuesday, Jan. 27 was written with the journalistic technique of that of a third-rate movie magazine.

The article (written by Faye Fiore) dealt with the alleged child molestation of a 7-year-old by a Catholic priest. The delicateness of this matter cannot be stressed enough. Fiore was accusive and convicting. Before there has even been an arraignment Fiore has labeled him guilty.

Fiore saw fit to contact S.L.A.M. (Concerned Citizens for Stronger Legislation Against Molesters) for their views on the issue. S.L.A.M. is made up of parents who have had convicted cases of this nature. To utter the word "molest" to these people triggers thoughts of their own hardships. The views of S.L.A.M. can only be one-sided. To contact them at this point is extremely premature for there has not even been an arraignment.

In the priest's defense she used the quote of a parishioner "But he's such a neat guy." Well said. This sophomoric statement stacked against Fiore's slanderous convictions gives the article an air of futility. One would read this, read the article, turn the page and "S.L.A.M." the imaginary prison door on the priest.

One must admit it takes uncompromising courage to be a journalist, and to write an article of this nature. Why then didn't Fiore have the courage to contact the priest or the family of the child? All of Fiore's information was secondhand.

Fiore, I can see you have reached your verdict. But you have also reached the

unknowing and poisoned their minds with your doubts.

TOM PUTH,
Thousand Oaks.

Best friends

Editor, News Chronicle:

Hi, my name is Ted Caloroso.

I'm Father Pat's best friend. I don't think you should put this crap in the paper. Father Pat always takes me to his ranch. He had never molested me or grabbed me, but he does kiss me on the cheek but that does not make him a fag.

Everybody is really mad about what you put in this paper and we want him back and I don't think nobody is going to buy your paper the way it is going. We all love him.

TED CALOROSO,
Thousand Oaks.

Fry politicians

Editor, News Chronicle:

Normally I do not write to newspaper editors, but lately I have been so excited out your articles that I feel you must be complimented, and — if you don't mind — I will point out how your newspaper might be able to do a real service for all of us in the Conejo Valley.

Having read your recent reports on clergymen, I have little doubt that should your newspaper direct as much attention to politicians, you would be able to quickly rid this state of inflation, air pollution, graft, bureaucracy, and high taxes.

Your article on Jan. 27 did a superb job of trial by innuendo. "Slam it to them! Where there is smoke, there's bound to be fire. You did a great job of making sure we all understood that the smoke was probably back. Putting all those opinions on the front page sure saves turning back to the editorial section, and it does a good job of firing the readers who never do.

On Jan. 29, you hit the front page with not one, but two, sizable headlines, again targeted at the clergy. That's what I call dedicated attention to public trouble spots.

That headline on the clergy and the hostages was my kind of journalism. The headline implied, "... all of the hostages killed the clergymen's visit a disservice." The story said some of the hostages made a claim. That's the way to do it! As we all know, any attempt to understate a situation will leave readers with the impression that newspaper has a soft underbelly and is afraid to raise the alarm when it is so obviously needed.

Pour it on, (News) Chronicle. But please tell the clergy stuff for a while. They work for near nothing and their only real reward is the satisfaction of helping others. There's

Nameless accuser

Editor, News Chronicle:

The article on Father Pat Roemer in the Jan. 27 issue was an unsubstantiated character assassination by some nameless, faceless accuser. There was no stated attempt to even get Father Roemer's comments.

The (News) Chronicle, we believe, has done the community and a well-known humanitarian a disservice.

MR. and MRS. RUDY LAUTERBACH,
Thousand Oaks.

Other news enough

Editor, News Chronicle:

Hasn't there been enough factual news of late to occupy your reporters? Surely, with a new president and the return of the hostages to Washington D.C. on Tuesday, your circulation must have been at an all-time high.

Tell me why, News Chronicle, did you have to publish with front-page sensationalism the article about Father Pat Roemer? What purpose did it serve? Allegations stemming from the mouth of a 7-year-old are hardly grounds for tarnishing the reputation of one who has done so much good for

our community and who is loved by so many Catholics and non-Catholics alike.

Would you have granted the same kind of coverage if the person accused had been a layman and not so well known? I think not.

World Book Dictionary gives as synonyms for the word "scandal" the three words "discredit, disrepute, dishonor." You have made an honest effort to bring all three to Father Roemer and, in doing so, have firmly established yourself as our neighborhood scandal sheet.

BRENDA YOUNG,
Thousand Oaks.

Charges are wrong

Editor, News Chronicle:

I'm a high school sophomore and I have known Father Roemer since the beginning of the eighth grade.

Is it that wrong to show a little affection toward a child? Come on! Anybody who knows Father Roemer will say these charges are wrong (News Chronicle, Jan. 27).

He is the only person I know in Thousand Oaks that does these things for kids. Practically every kid in St. Paschal's has went out with Father Roemer.

He has taken me out many, many times and he has never done anything wrong. He tries to do so many things for kids. When I needed a job, he got me one, when my brother or I played sports or any other kid played sports, he watched us, and (he) is even my godfather.

I would just like to say that my whole family loves him and I know I could say that a lot of other families do too. These accusations make me very upset. So people who believe the same way I do — write up.

PAT POWERS and FAMILY,
Thousand Oaks.

Why not wait?

Editor, News Chronicle:

Re: Article that appeared Tuesday, Jan. 27 regarding Father Pat Roemer.

I'm really very upset about your article concerning Father Pat Roemer. Do you realize how much that man is admired and loved by so many children and adults? If you did, you wouldn't have been so quick to write what you did.

First of all, a man is innocent until proven guilty, right? This being the case, why the hell couldn't you wait to see the outcome of the hearing in court before you even printed this story? If you had to print it at all!

Aren't there enough newsworthy stories these days?

DIANE GODFREY,
Thousand Oaks.

Bury the story

Editor, News Chronicle:

My late husband, Ken Shane, gave Thousand Oaks its first newspaper, known as the Thousand Oaks News. At the time he was also publisher and editor of the Ventura County News.

He had tremendous knowledge of news reporting and knew how to maintain the rights and dignity of all people, including men of the cloth. I am sure if he were here today, he would agree with me that Faye Fiore presented her news reporting of the Rev. Donald Roemer in very bad taste.

There was no need to "hot shot" the first story by giving it top billing on the front

page. It could have been buried on the second or third page. This also applies to the story published on March 3. The embarrassment of the priest as well as the boys involved would have been less damaging.

Judging from your comments about the phone calls you received and from the numerous letters to the editor printed in the paper, should tell you that Fiore's stories are not worthy of front page material. The country is not big enough for two Madalyn O'Hairs.

MRS. KENNETH SHANE,
Newbury Park.

They deserve an apology

Editor, News Chronicle:

I read with dismay but not surprise the equivalent of a guilty plea of Rev. D. Patrick Roemer to sexually molesting three young boys in his parish (News Chronicle, March 3). It was painful to accept the fact that a clergyman in a position of trust and responsibility should so disregard his sacred obligations and use the people he promised to help. However, I'm not surprised since Catholic ordination does not immunize a man from being human and weak.

Yet, it disturbs me that many in our Catholic community refused to accept the

possibility that "their" priest could be guilty. The testimonials written by the children were an immature and poor response, I believe, encouraged by frightened parents.

The News Chronicle and Faye Fiore deserve an apology from the individuals who bitterly maligned and accused them of poor journalism. Many in the community overreached their feelings instead of (using) reason and logic. Father Roemer needs our prayers and compassion, not our judgment.

F. BIANCHINO, Ph.D.,
Thousand Oaks.

What is achieved?

Editor, News Chronicle:

I am constantly amazed how we tend to exaggerate and go to extremes without the slightest thought of the consequences. This is especially true of our print media. Anything provocative, blemishing has to be "exposed" and goes to the front page. No cover-ups is the slogan today. Sadly, no tact, decency or good judgment either.

The story about Father Roemer did get to the front page of our newspaper (Jan. 27). As a mother, I do understand the concern (to put it mildly) of the involved parents. But would it not have been resolved better if the parents went straight to the administrative head of the local church and told him of their shocking discovery? This probably would have settled the matter quietly and efficiently without the irrevocable damage to the man himself and to the many children who were innocently associated with him. You see, many children truly loved Father Roemer, because he was loving and caring to them. And now, children's innocent affection for the man and even memory of many really good things he did for them are permanently marred by suspicion. And the worst kind of suspicion — concerning love and plain human warmth.

So what do we achieve by making all matters public, without discrimination and mature judgment?

HELEN PARISKY,
Thousand Oaks.

Absence would hurt

Editor, News Chronicle:

I would like to make a comment on the article that was written about Father Roemer molesting a child in the newspaper (front page) on Jan. 27.

Now first of all I know Father Roemer very well and he wouldn't even dream about molesting a child. He has loved to work with children. Look, he even teaches boys how to be altar boys. I used to go to Madrona Elementary School and he would come and visit with everybody. A lot of kids love Father Roemer and it would hurt them if Father Roemer couldn't work with them any more.

P.S. Father Roemer, we're all behind you and we love you!

WENDY GRASMEHR,
12 years old,
Thousand Oaks.

Total support

Editor, News Chronicle:

Today (Jan. 27) the News Chronicle reached an all-time low in smut sensationalism. The name of Father Roemer, a most respected and loved priest and Conejo citizen, was smeared in a devastatingly brutal front-page article. Such poor judgment in journalism has no place in our newspaper. The shock of reading this unfairly biased article will remain with us for a long time to come.

Father Roemer has contributed enormously to our St. Paschal Baylon parish and to the whole Conejo community. He has even received awards for his services and his work with children of all ages has been admired and greatly appreciated by parents. He has that unique gift of communicating God's word to children and enabling them to express their love of God. This has been most evident in our youngest children in the parish through his work in the development of our preschool religious education program.

Our children, like all other children Father Roemer comes into contact with, love him for the kind of person he is. We share our children's love for him.

Father Roemer has the complete confidence and total support of our family. We're sure this feeling is shared by all who know him. It is our hope and prayer that this matter will be resolved very soon. In the meantime, it is hoped that the News Chronicle will demonstrate better judgment in reporting such smut.

JOSEPH and BONNIE CABRAL,
Thousand Oaks.

Truly a 'Father'

Editor, News Chronicle:

Some close observations, over a long period of time and more recently, have caused a few facts to be impressed on me as indelibly certain:

1. Some News Chronicle articles contain exactly one side of the news, coupled with statements of persons who would support that same side of the report.
2. Some presidents of certain organizations do not know what a S.L.A.M. is.
3. Some parents are uncertain enough of what their child meant that they are obliged to call a certain friend to check to see if the child was telling the story correctly.
4. Certain friends are really sure what to do.
5. Millions of persons are incapable of recognizing that there are, in this world, a very few persons, men and women, married or single, who have consecrated their lives to God with a far higher love than most of us will ever understand, because it is really divine love. Many of these few persons reach an interior moral and spiritual plane which would totally preclude any immoral act.
6. Some of these few persons are hidden in cloisters and monasteries; some are quiet, everyday husbands or wives — even perhaps children; some are Mother Theresas; some are your favorite grocery clerks or the company janitor. Some are the ministers and priests in your own town. You find out if you work with someone for a long time just which of these few persons would be holy, consecrated, dedicated in such a high way, that even an accusation, even a signed complaint at a police station could not change that person's inability to be immoral, could not change that person's intrinsic innocence.
7. Such a person — a priest closely associating with our Conejo children for a long time now — is the one who has truly earned the title "Father": the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer.

MRS. LOIS A. JACKSON,
Thousand Oaks.

popular 3 bed room, 2.5 bath condo in Agoura. Upgraded carpeting, cathedral ceilings, large deck with panoramic view. Community pool, spa and tennis court. Good financing. WL 005. Karen Robb. \$136,500.

POOL & FRUIT TREES
Large family home. 4+3+ more rooms added that could be used for maid's room, in-laws, hobby room etc. Heated pool. Circular drive with used brick exterior trim. Fruit trees and R' parking. WL-008. Mary Holtgrewe. \$198,000.

HORSE PROPERTY
Avocado producing ranch. bedrooms, view, spa, brick barbecue, Jenn-air range microwave; everything new. Potential lot split. WL-381. Mary Holtgrewe. \$225,000.

Offices in: Beverly Hills, B Northridge, Pacific Palms

The future problem

Editor, News Chronicle:

(Copy of a letter to John Dettie, President, Conejo Future Foundation):

As members of the foundation, we wish to tell you of our activities. We would like to also apprise you of our needs in this community.

Through various fund-raisers, we have set aside monies for cultural activities for our children. These activities have included mime, theater, band and opera. We are planning experiences in ballet and various other dance forms such as Hawaiian and Irish. We are also planning to have artists work at our school so that our students can see these creative people in their media. Our aim is to expose our students to cultural pursuits and to have them understand and appreciate the background, talent and education necessary for the arts.

In order to have the proper setting for the finished product, we need an auditorium. We have bused children to Shrine Auditorium for opera. We have had floor seating at our school for various activities. However, an auditorium would be wonderful!

We support the effort toward building a cultural center in The Conejo. We are aware of our good fortune in giving these experiences to our children. We also recognize that other schools cannot provide these things for their students. An auditorium would benefit everyone.

The proposed center should be large enough to accommodate first-class productions and exhibits. We are doing our best to provide a concerned and appreciative future public for cultural events in The Conejo. Now is the time for action.

Thank you for your efforts. Please notify us if we can help you.

FAYE LONG, President,
JOYCE BUNKIN, Cultural Chairwoman,
Meadows PTA Board,
Thousand Oaks.

Unforgivable act

Editor, News Chronicle:

I became a victim today, one among many from reading the local paper tonight, of another one of those senseless car burglaries and malicious damage to my car. It was not so much the idea that after working all night and then coming out in the morning to find my car had been broken into and my stereo and digital clock stolen. But to add insult to injury, that the perpetrators had to go and do the damage they did is unforgivable.

All I have to say is that whoever got into my car at the IBM parking lot last night and stole my stereo and digital clock, I hope you enjoy it but why you had to go and do the damage is beyond me. I can forget about the stereo and the clock but never will I forgive you for the damage.

JIM OWEN,
Thousand Oaks.

We are better

Editor, News Chronicle:

Dear Father Roemer, please know that we love you for yourself and all the tireless hours you have so unselfishly given us. We respect you for all the many new programs, clubs and activities you started during your few years in this parish. They were really needed.

We are better people because of the many inspired and acuminous sermons you gave us. When you spoke, we all listened, young

and old, and we know it's not always easy to catch youth's ear.

Although it's impossible to do so adequately, we thank you for all you have done for us and pray that God will give you the strength and courage to go through this very difficult period.

If there is anything I can do to help in any way, I would consider it a privilege.
HELENE ACTON,
Thousand Oaks.

Is it conditional?

Editor, News Chronicle:

What I have read from Father Roemer's friends and supporters is, "We know that you did not do these terrible things." Is your love and support conditional? Are you saying that regardless of the outcome of this case, we are still your friends and support you, no matter what?

If not, then a terrible burden is being placed upon this human being.

Then what about the children? Are these not also human beings with equal rights which preserve their dignity, respect and trust?

Working with children has taught me that they will try very hard to please the adults in their lives. To conclude that they always fabricate is to condemn children; thus making it impossible for other children to come forward should this ever become necessary.

CANDY CUNNINGHAM,
Thousand Oaks.

Losing patience

Editor, News Chronicle:

I am rapidly losing patience with the News Chronicle. Your front-page headline, "Community stunned by report of priest's arrest," should have read, "Community outraged by slanted news report."

And do not ever again refer to a Roman Catholic priest by his surname only. The correct title is "Father," "Reverend," or "Reverend Father."

LARRY PEACOCK,
Thousand Oaks.

Perverved world

Editor, News Chronicle:

My name is Erika Luneberg. I am 14 and an attendant of St. Paschal Baylon parish. I am writing to you to inform you of my opinion (most likely to be the feeling of many others also).

Today on my way home from school I was informed of Father Roemer's charge and on what pretenses they were made. I was shocked and amazed. Now when I think of it, it is the most appalling, ludicrous, ridiculous idea that I have ever heard. I was previously a member of the youth group and my brother is an altar boy. We both know and like Father Roemer very much. The idea of this is just plain dumb!

As I have stated before, I am 14 and my brother is 12. We are both what would be termed children but we are old enough to know when something is being done. If we or any other children our age or above filed such a complaint, the shenanigans that are going on now would be acceptable, but at the age of 6 or 7! The idea that a man such as Father Roemer should be accused of a crime such as this by the word of a 6- or 7-year-old child is obnoxious! As for the statement of Jessie Kloppenburg of SLAM, "People sometimes believe that if a person

is a man of God, he is above all of this . . . "I and the many others complaining are certainly aware that a priest is capable of such a crime. I ask you, Jessie, "Do you know him?"

I would most sincerely accept a chance to testify in behalf of Father Roemer and many others would, too. I have one question to ask of you. Is this world becoming so perverted as to claim a simple hug or touch, a sign of friendship and caring, as an act of child molestation? If so, I sincerely wonder what type of crummy world I will live in when I am an adult.

ERIKA LUNEBERG,
Thousand Oaks.

Not ashamed

Editor, News Chronicle:

We members of St. Paschal's youth group would like to comment on the article published on Jan. 27 concerning Father Roemer, and the way it was written. We feel that the article was very biased.

In this country, is a man guilty till proven innocent, or is he innocent till proven guilty? We feel that the manner in which the article was written presents Father Roemer as guilty till proven innocent. We could not see how you let such a sensationalistic article be published, for the only judgment that should be rendered is in the courtroom by due process.

Even if the story is retracted, the damage is done, and has greatly hurt the career of one of the neatest people we know. Father Roemer has done so many nice things for us in so many ways, like just being there when you needed someone to talk to.

In the article written, no names were mentioned in his condemnation, but we of St. Paschal's youth group are not ashamed to know, love and support Father Roemer.

DAN DEMARTINI, BETTY HAUTMAN,
BOB CUSICK, MONICA MARTINEZ,
EVA CUSICK, LAURA GILLETTE,
GYLE GRASHMEHR, LISA FREEBERG,
DEBI CITO, SHEILA BURGER,
SUSAN MCFALL, TERRY MCCANN,
MICHAEL SCHANGKEI, DIANNE
BRYCE,

JOHN PASS, PAUL DESLAURIER,
DENISE HOFACKER, SANDY MCFALL,
CLIFF MACCANN, VERONICA DEVIN-
CENTI,

CINDY SMITHBOWER, TODD BEN-
NETT,

CATHY NOSEWORTHY, FELIX MASCI,
Thousand Oaks.

Loud and clear

Editor, News Chronicle:

The News Chronicle is registered as "Official Newspaper, City of Thousand Oaks." A 1979 prize-winning newspaper of the California Publishers Association. You apparently have been doing a lot of things right in order to achieve this distinction. Your "Editor's note" in the Friday Jan. 30, edition points out this fact, but you lost all credibility in your final paragraph, and I quote, "No, we don't print only bad news. Or scandal. Or smut. But I can't help but wonder whether people read anything else that we print, no matter how often or how prominent the printing of it is." Mr. Editor; you said it, I didn't.

When an editor has to wonder if people read anything else beside scandal or smut he has lost the feel of his job. I think the answer came through loud and clear in your treatment of the Rev. Father Donald Roemer case. Your editorial judgment in the prominent printing area is questionable:

however, the Saturday Daily News vindicated your action by using prominent printing space in their paper. The big monkey had to imitate the little monkey in order to preserve family tradition or be scooped.

Several years ago the physical director of the YMCA in an Ohio community similar to Thousand Oaks was under an investigation of a child molesting charge. He was a highly respected family man and a civic leader in the community. The editor of the local paper, about the size of the News Chronicle, recognized the impact that a sensational front-page story would have on the community. He tempered his judgment by writing a low-key factual article which was read and discussed with disbelief in many homes. When the case came to court all the facts were brought out and the judge placed the man on probation subject to psychiatric treatment. This editor recognized his responsibility in the handling of a delicate subject in a community newspaper. The man was removed from his Y job, but after treatment he took his place as a normal member of society. Many humans, regardless of their calling in life, are subject to character imperfections. These people need to be helped, not destroyed by publicity. Let the judicial system analyze the facts first to determine guilt or innocence and then you can do your thing.

It is a sad commentary on American journalism when any newspaper has to exploit the apparent actions of a sick mind in order to attract readership, especially when an editor wonders "if people read anything else."

GEORGE THOMAS,
Thousand Oaks.

SLAM clarified

Editor, News Chronicle:

Regarding the letter by Tom Puth (Feb. 1) I would like to clarify a couple of points.

In his letter, Puth states: "SLAM is made up of parents who have had convicted cases of this nature. To utter the word 'molest' to these people triggers thoughts of their own hardships. The views of SLAM can only be one-sided."

I am a member of SLAM and have two small boys. Neither of them have ever been molested, nor have I or any member of my family. To my knowledge, the 20 to 30 people most actively involved with SLAM in this area have not had problems with molestation.

We are not a bunch of fanatics out to jail every person who smiles at a child. We are simply parents who are very concerned at the high incidence of child molestings and want to help decrease and prevent repeat offenses through stiffer laws.

Children are vulnerable victims. In their innocence they trust most adults. Adults mean authority. Adults mean love, reward, punishment, approval -- so many aspects of adulthood that can be used to manipulate a child.

Children are in the tender process of developing and forming the attitudes and values they will have for life. Abuse at this stage has serious and long-reaching effects.

It is crucial that we listen to and show love to our children and do all we can to add to their protection. How can we hope for a stable, well-adjusted future society if we don't place more importance on their development of healthy attitudes?

As far as the Father Roemer case goes, I am personally not convicting the man (whether I be affiliated with SLAM or not). That would simply be unfair. But it would be equally unfair to discard the boys' story out of hand. Nothing has been proven one way or the other. Isn't this why we have a

judicial system -- to try to access the truth and dispense justice? So let's be fair to everyone and keep an open mind until the truth comes forth.

MRS. KATHY AUSTEN,
Thousand Oaks.

Unenviable position

Editor, News Chronicle:

It must come as no shock that your position in the Father Roemer case is an unenviable one. The degree of public reaction to your coverage has been intense, and at times virulent. But there are issues involved that most of your critics fail to consider.

Other cases like this have been covered in your paper, many with the same or even greater prominence. It is hard, however, to imagine a case with the emotional potential of this one, because of the involvement of a priest. That seems to have clouded the issues of responsibility and propriety that an editor must consider. While the First Amendment allows the press freedom to select its subject matter and the coverage given it, it also imposes an obligation, in exactly the same sense, though not to the same degree as the Watergate or Abacost stories. Though dissimilar in subject, they are important in that no one, not the government, not pressure groups, not even private citizens has the right to proscribe what the rest of us shall know. Certainly, there are always groups who would like to restrict coverage of their own activities. Any responsible paper should never back away from a story because of its emotional content.

When any paper abuses the rights guaranteed by the First Amendment, it is the responsibility of all of us to stop supporting you. You have not abused those rights. It must have been with a terrible sense of sadness that you decided to go ahead with your coverage of the Father Roemer story. And it would seem that you feel obligated to fulfill your responsibilities with the amount of letters critical of that coverage.

In a follow-up article, concerning another investigation of Father Roemer, it was stated that any 6- or 7-year-old could not make up such an account of sexual encounter. But that encounter could have taken place with someone other than Father Roemer, and been confused in the child's mind, for whatever reasons. I must take issue with you on the inclusion of that paragraph in your coverage. It would have in no way harmed the thoroughness of your reporting to have deleted it.

It is certainly understandable that the sheriff's department has refused to release the identity of the child and his family who have brought the charges. Judging from the reaction so far, it would not be out of the question for pressure to be brought against that family. It would be tragic if Father Roemer is in fact innocent, and this incident destroys him through a false conviction. But wouldn't it be just as tragic, and as horrible, if he is guilty, and public outcry frightens witnesses from telling their story? And the man would not get the help he needs if he is indeed guilty.

Some people seem to interpret this as an attack on their religious beliefs. It is not such an attack. Father Roemer is a man, and just might be as frail as any of the rest of us. One can only hope that the truth will ultimately be known.

DON HUNT,
Newbury Park.

(With this letter, we will suspend publication of letters on the subject pending further developments. — EDITOR)

letters

Means so much

Editor, News Chronicle:

The article that was printed in your paper, Page 1, Jan. 27, concerning Father Donald Patrick Roemer was a total outrage! Your article has proven him guilty before his court date. This man means so much to our own family, not to mention the entire congregation of St. Paschal's. If this man is cleared, he will carry the shadow you cast over his life to his grave, and all because the News Chronicle likes to sensationalize at all costs. He has given his life to God and his congregation and you slipped it right from under him.

If anyone quotes anything from your paper without other proof, I would never believe them and I would tell them why. The News Chronicle loves to sensationalize.

JOYCE ZAR,
Thousand Oaks.

Children hurt

Editor, News Chronicle:

Regarding your article about Father Roemer on Jan. 27.

I was shocked and mad after reading your article about Father Roemer. As a concerned parent I condemn anything that would hurt the mental and physical well-being of our children. Do you realize how many children you have hurt by printing such a story? Granted, you don't know him, but to print such a story before the man has been found guilty is a grave injustice.

I would like to ask the parents of the child in this case as members of the parish, why didn't you contact the parish itself? Don't you trust the church you attend?

Father Roemer has achieved what parents and educators work for — the love of our children and I hate to see this crumble because of a probable misunderstanding.

Father Roemer, Melissa and Michael send you their love; they want you back soon!
MARY L. BORAU,
Thousand Oaks.

Close friend

Editor, News Chronicle:

I am a close friend to Father Pat. He taught me how to be an altar boy. Don't you think he feels pretty bad right now? But putting it in the newspaper (is) pretty outright stupid; he feels embarrassed enough without putting it in the paper when the person has earned up nicknames as "Incredible Father Hulk," or "Bionic Priest" or "Super Priest," or "Mini Priest."

The printing of stories should be brought in more consideration. The first story's bad enough but to print another one (pretty stupid, huh?)

P.S. Come back to Redwood (Intermediate School) soon.

CHRIS HEIMLER,
Thousand Oaks.

State of shock

Editor, News Chronicle:

I am certain those of us who are a part of the Catholic community here in Thousand Oaks are in a state of shock concerning the accusations brought against our Father Roemer, of St. Paschal's. At this point in time, all we can do is wait to hear the evidence and the verdict as to whether Father is guilty or innocent. Knowing Father as we do, we would rather believe he is innocent and pray our beliefs are correct.

I am horribly angry over this entire incident, but my anger for the moment is directed strictly at the News Chronicle and the reporter who took it upon herself to

smear the name of a very loving man before he was declared guilty or innocent. The damage has been done now, Faye Fiore, and God willing, if Father is declared innocent I would not want what you have done on my conscience.

I ask you, News Chronicle, and Fiore, why did you not take it upon yourself to print the name of the 7-year-old and his parents and the friends of the parents who involved themselves in this horrid story? You tell me the difference and what gives you the right to smear the name of a man of God and not the name of a 7-year-old, and don't give me that song and dance because the child is a minor and it is for his own protection. What about someone protecting Father Roemer? I find this act you have committed abominable, deplorable and abusive to the entire Catholic community and the administrators of St. Paschal's. God help your miserable souls and God help us all in the future if this is the kind of prejudging we are all destined to be exposed to in this community by the news media.

I now direct the next question to the parents of the child in question. Why did you not go directly to the church administrators with your accusations? It was a low, cheap shot to involve any outsider until you took it up with church authorities. You allowed your friends to make Father Roemer the center ring of a three-ring circus. God help us all if this is what we have to contend with in today's society. Leave it to the news media to get our blood boiling. I suggest, Fiore, the next time you jump the gun to get a sensational story, you call upon your own God and conscience to guide your every step.

MRS. FRANCINE JUSTICE SHERMAN
and FAMILY,
Thousand Oaks.

Wrong reasons

Editor, News Chronicle:

Is there room for one more letter concerning the Father Roemer case? It seems that many people are getting hot for what appears to me the wrong reasons.

1. To imply that an accusation from a 7-year-old has little credibility because of his youthful age is terribly unjust. I find this an odd and embarrassing kind of a story for a child to be making up. More children should be given a responsive but still discerning ear.

2. Perhaps this "checking with a friend" about the child's story was in an effort to be fair to Father Roemer, so as not to take such an accusation lightly.

3. I also ask, what makes a man of the cloth exempt from emotional disturbances? It has happened before. Does this mean that any person holding a position of influence and respect should automatically be free from suspicion?

4. And to say that any person has an inability to be immoral sounds quite presumptuous to me. The only person I can think of who could claim that virtue is Jesus. We are all struggling with our human desires to some degree or another.

5. I am not saying this man is guilty. I have no way of knowing. And I am not refuting those who believe him to be a fine man. But the danger in blindly discounting a serious accusation disturbs me greatly. It is important that every claim of this sort is thoroughly investigated to protect the innocent.

6. The major fault here, I think, is of the newspaper's handling and coverage of this matter. Since a man's reputation and career could be irrevocably damaged, as in this case, can't the paper wait to report until after it has been determined whether the man is innocent or guilty?

MRS. KATHY AUSTEN,
Thousand Oaks.

Second father

Editor, News Chronicle:

I am 13 years old and I'm in junior high. I've known Father Pat since fifth grade, as well as my brothers, ages 12 and 8, have spent many hours and days alone with Father Pat and I think it's wrong what people are doing to him. He's almost like a second father to me and I love him very much. I know he wouldn't do such a thing like he's accused of to anyone. Sure he hugs me and I love him because he is just showing me how much he loves me. I play tennis with him and he takes me to many different places.

I just want to say that a lot of people are behind Father Pat and we all love him very much.

JOHN RODRIGUEZ and FAMILY,
Thousand Oaks.

In third place

Editor, News Chronicle:

I am 14 years old and my sister is 12 years old. Ever since I knew Father Pat, he has never made any of those things a little 7-year-old boy stated to the police and you (News Chronicle) to me or to my sister. He has taken a lot of my friends and myself to different places all over. Last year he took all the eighth-graders on a retreat to Malibu before our Confirmation. He works with all children all the time and my sister says he goes through all the CCD (Confraternity of Christine Doctrine) classes and says hello.

I thought that printing that article on the front page was really low-class. As one lady said in the letters to the editor on Jan. 30, that this paper was a scandal sheet on her street and I have to agree with her on that because everybody at school and along the streets talk about this article. This paper was first on my list of papers but now it is third out of only two papers.

All my friends agree with me saying we are behind you 100 percent, Father Pat. We all know you are not guilty and we hope the district attorney of Ventura County will notice it, too.

We love you, Father Pat!
SCOTT MCINTYRE,
Thousand Oaks.

Will rebuild life

Editor, News Chronicle:

I cannot believe that article about Father Pat Roemer in the News Chronicle on Jan. 27. Your article is totally untrue and I really do not believe it in my heart. I think you have ruined Father Pat's relationship with the little kids but I hope that he will still have the contact with kids he once had. Knowing Father Pat, he will rebuild his life and I will always love him, no matter what and so will everyone else. He is someone everyone can talk to and we know that he can help us with our problems and understand us too.

Father Roemer is great and he loves all of us kids here at St. Paschal's school and all kids he comes in contact with. I am really sorry for the parents of the 7-year-old boy for they don't understand the true meaning of love with respect and dignity.

I would just like to say that we back Father Pat and everyone loves you, Father. Please come back to St. Paschal's parish because we love you and need you.

MATTHEW WESTENDORF,
Thousand Oaks.

Stockholders win

Editor, News Chronicle:

In mid-January, the Ventura County Federation of Republican Women met in Thousand Oaks and were addressed by James Foy, editorial director of TV station KNBC

February 4, 1981

REDACTED

Dear REDACTED

The gift of your letter is greatly appreciated.

All of us do indeed need a constant support
in prayer and charity to sustain our life in Christ. Your caring is a
very precious blessing.

Sincerely yours,

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

5923

Times Valley Section 2-5-81

Molestation Charges Against Priest Split Community

Some Parents Support Clergyman but Another Group Backs Police; Innocent Plea Entered

By JAMES QUINN, Times Staff Writer

The arrest of a popular Thousand Oaks parish priest on multiple charges of child molestation has stunned the community and led to a flurry of accusations between an anti-child molestation group and supporters of the clergyman.

The Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer, known as "Father Pat" to the hundreds of youngsters he has counseled at St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church, has pleaded innocent to seven felony counts and two misdemeanor counts of child molesting, involving nine different boys. The indictment alleges he made "advances of a sexual nature" against the boys during an eight-month period ending Jan. 26.

Roemer, 36, has been ordered to appear for a preliminary hearing Feb. 16 in Ventura Municipal Court.

Accompanied by Parents

At his arraignment, Roemer was accompanied by a handful of parents from several Catholic parishes in the Conejo Valley.

They accompanied him into and from the courtroom in a show of support and made statements attacking the police for filing the charges and newspapers for reporting them.

Supporters physically shielded Roemer from reporters and photographers.

"Why are you doing this to him?" one woman shouted at reporters.

Also present, but to show support for the police, were members of Concerned Parents for Stronger Legislation

Against Child Molesters (SLAM), a Ventura County-based organization working for stronger laws against child molesters and longer jail sentences for those convicted of child molesting.

At the same time that Roemer was being arraigned in Ventura, a Mass was being conducted at St. Paschal. The church reportedly was filled with parishioners praying for the priest.

From the outset, the case has upset a wide spectrum of Conejo Valley residents.

The Thousand Oaks News Chronicle reported receiving a "flood of phone calls" from persons who "angrily criticized" the local daily paper for reporting the priest's arrest.

Since arriving in Thousand Oaks several years ago, Roemer has become widely known for his work with youngsters.

The Parent Teachers Assn. awarded him its 1980 Honorary Service Award for his work as counselor to children and organizer of youth activities.

Penny Lord, a parishioner at St. Jude's Catholic Church in Thousand Oaks who accompanied Roemer at the arraignment, said, "Our priests are constant targets. All priests are like sacrificial lambs."

Bud Sweeney, a St. Paschal's parishioner, said the arrest has "ruined the man. There's a lot of bad that could be caused by this, especially because this man has been working with children for years."

Another supporter complained, "The very same people who arrested him (the police) are the ones who

would call him in the middle of the night to ask his help with a teen-ager."

Jessie Kloppenburg, national president of SLAM, said after the arraignment, "I wonder why adults find it so hard to believe children..."

"People sometimes believe that if a person is a man of God, he is above all of this... I have compassion for him and I know his feelings, but I still have feelings for children, too."

SLAM was organized two years ago following the conviction of Theodore Frank for the torture-murder of Amy Lou Seltz, a Camarillo toddler. Frank had been convicted previously for child molestation but had been released from prison after psychiatrists pronounced him able to return to society.

Criticism From Judges

The organization has drawn sharp criticism from some Ventura County judges who say they feel pressured by the presence of SLAM members in their courtrooms and by letter-writing campaigns that SLAM members have launched against specific judges they accuse of lenient sentencing practices.

After Roemer's preliminary hearing, a judge will decide whether there is enough evidence to order him to stand trial.

The complaint alleges that of the nine boys Roemer is accused of molesting, eight are under the age of 14. Police said two of them are ages 6 and 7.

Molestation Charges Against Priest Split Community

Some Parents Support Clergyman but Another Group Backs Police; Innocent Plea Entered

By JAMES QUINN, Times Staff Writer

LOS ANGELES TIMES February 5, 1981

The arrest of a popular Thousand Oaks parish priest on multiple charges of child molestation has stunned the community and led to a flurry of accusations between an anti-child molestation group and supporters of the clergyman.

The Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer, known as "Father Pat" to the hundreds of youngsters he has counseled at St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church, has pleaded innocent to seven felony counts and two misdemeanor counts of child molesting, involving nine different boys. The indictment alleges he made "advances of a sexual nature" against the boys during an eight-month period ending Jan. 26.

Roemer, 38, has been ordered to appear for a preliminary hearing Feb. 16 in Ventura Municipal Court.

Accompanied by Parents

At his arraignment, Roemer was accompanied by a handful of parents from several Catholic parishes in the Conejo Valley.

They accompanied him into and from the courtroom in a show of support and made statements attacking the police for filing the charges and newspapers for reporting them.

Supporters physically shielded Roemer from reporters and photographers.

"Why are you doing this to him?" one woman shouted at reporters.

Also present, but to show support for the police, were members of Concerned Parents for Stronger Legislation.

Against Child Molesters (SLAM), a Ventura County-based organization working for stronger laws against child molesters and longer jail sentences for those convicted of child molesting.

At the same time that Roemer was being arraigned in Ventura, a Mass was being conducted at St. Paschal. The church reportedly was filled with parishioners praying for the priest.

From the outset, the case has upset a wide spectrum of Conejo Valley residents.

The Thousand Oaks News Chronicle reported receiving a "flood of phone calls" from persons who "angrily criticized" the local daily paper for reporting the priest's arrest.

Since arriving in Thousand Oaks several years ago, Roemer has become widely known for his work with youngsters.

The Parent Teachers Assn. awarded him its 1980 Honorary Service Award for his work as counselor to children and organizer of youth activities.

Penny Lord, a parishioner at St. Jude's Catholic Church in Thousand Oaks who accompanied Roemer at the arraignment, said, "Our priests are constant targets. All priests are like sacrificial lambs."

But Sweeney, a St. Paschal's parishioner, said the arrest has "ruined the man. There's a lot of bad that could be caused by this, especially because this man has been working with children for years."

Another supporter complained, "The very same people who arrested him (the police) are the ones who

would call him in the middle of the night to ask his help with a teen-ager."

Jessie Kloppenburg, national president of SLAM, said after the arraignment, "I wonder why adults find it so hard to believe children."

"People sometimes believe that if a person is a man of God, he is above all of this. . . I have compassion for him and I know his feelings, but I still have feelings for children, too."

SLAM was organized two years ago following the conviction of Theodore Frank for the torture-murder of Amy Lou Setzka (Camarillo toddler). Frank had been convicted previously for child molestation but had been released from prison after psychiatrists pronounced him able to return to society.

Criticism From Judges

The organization has drawn sharp criticism from some Ventura County judges who say they feel pressured by the presence of SLAM members in their courtrooms, and by letter-writing campaigns that SLAM members have launched against specific judges they accuse of lenient sentencing practices.

After Roemer's preliminary hearing, a judge will decide whether there is enough evidence to order him to stand trial.

The complaint alleges that of the nine boys Roemer is accused of molesting, eight are under the age of 14. Police said two of them are ages 6 and 7.

ON CHANGE LIST

FEB 28 1981

February 9, 1981

Reverend Donald P. Roemer
c/o St. John's Seminary
5012 E. Seminary Road
Camarillo, California 93010

Dear Father Roemer:

This will serve to confirm our telephone conversation that as of 1 February 1981 you are officially designated by His Eminence, Cardinal Manning, to be on Sick Leave.

As of 12 February 1981 we would kindly ask that you take up residence at

MATER DOLOROSA MONASTERY
700 N. Sunnyside Avenue
Sierra Madre, California 91024

With kindest best regards, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Reverend Monsignor John A. Rawden
Chancellor

ag

cc: Rev. REDACTED

Rev.

Monsignor Hawkes

Blind copy Rev. REDACTED

REDACTED

Cardinal Timothy Manning
Chancery Office
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Dear Cardinal Manning:

We all miss Father Pat
Boemer terribly - I am
speaking especially for myself,
my husband, and our
children. We want him and
his warm, loving, caring in-
fluence back in our St.
Paschal's parish as soon as
possible. He is very
particularly in our prayers

5916

each day, asking God, that
if it be His Will, that Mr.
Goemer will be back with
us very soon again.

We beg of you, your
Excellency, to pray very
hard for any decisions
you have to make re-
garding Father, and we hope
and pray those decisions will
somehow bring Father Pat
back to us.

Sincerely & prayerfully,

REDACTED

REDACTED



Cardinal Timothy Manning
Chancery Office
1531 West Ninth St.
Los Angeles, CA 90015

5918

Nice to hear
good things

98

99

5919

February 20, 1981

Reverend Donald P. Roemer
Mater Dolorosa Monastery
700 N. Sunnyside Avenue
Sierra Madre, California 91024

Dear Father Roemer:

This will serve to confirm our telephone call that effect 1 February 1981 you are officially designated by His Eminence to be on Sick Leave.

As of Monday, February 23 we would ask that you take sp residence at

St. Mary's Seminary/Novitiate
1964 Las Canoas Road
Santa Barbara 93105
(805) 966-4829

With kindest best regards, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Reverend Monsignor John A. Rawden
Chancellor

REDACTED

cc: Msgr. Hawkes
Father REDACTED
Father
Father

February 25, 1981

REDACTED

Dear REDACTED

His Eminence, Cardinal Manning, asked that I acknowledge with his gratitude your kind letter of 19 February 1981, concerning Father Patrick Roemer.

It is always a pleasure to receive a letter indicating the respect and appreciation of our good people for one of our brother priests.

With kindest regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

Rev. Msgr. John A. Rowden
Chancellor

REDACTED

House Foreign Affairs Committee for El Salvador, and a fervent plea for aid by a day the State Department may in terms of foreign policy. Secretary Hagel apparently believes is increasing the number of U.S. troops in the country.

Inside today

County sunshine is back, but not for long.....B-3



After months of hedging, Barry says "yes" — A-11

- College non-teachers want better deal A-12
- Buena students yawn way to success...B-3
- Broken leg, broken dreams for Kings D-1
- Astrp-Graph B-8
- Business, finance B-4
- Comics, puzzle A-10
- Dance, Abby A-7
- Editorial B-2
- Erma Bombeck A-7
- Heloise A-7
- Jacoby bridge A-9
- Dr. Lamb A-3
- Names in the news A-3
- Obituaries B-3
- Pastor's name A-4
- People pages B-1
- Sports A-9
- Theater A-9
- TV tonight A-9
- Want ads start on B-4
- Weather roundup A-3



Freeze on hiring in county lifted; \$5 million saved

By Dennis Wagner
The hiring freeze in Ventura County government has been lifted, officials announced this morning. The result of new county spending cuts, the freeze was imposed by the Board of Supervisors in 1977. County supervisors imposed the hiring freeze to save money and to work with the Chief Administrative Office in cutting back spending for the rest of the year. Chief Administrative Officer Richard W. Smith said that all agencies and department heads can. Based on new spending cuts and projected revenue increases, he said, there will be a savings of \$3,047,400 in the 1980-81 fiscal budget. County Supervisor John Flynn of Oxnard said, "It took an hour of this

aspects as crime lab equipment at the county jail, not to make any cuts in services," Wittenberg said. "I think we're doing everything we can to make sure we're not cutting anything out of the county budget." The hiring freeze will spending cuts in the county budget. Because supervisors feared that the cuts in state and federal revenue during the next year. Based on Gov. Edmund G. Brown Jr.'s proposed budget, supervisors had expected funding decreases ranging from 10 to 20 million. Board members had said that the effect of state revenue cuts is still unclear. He said specific figures can't be drawn from "the smoke-screen budget of Governor Brown." The hiring freeze was imposed by the Board of Supervisors in 1977. County supervisors imposed the hiring freeze to save money and to work with the Chief Administrative Office in cutting back spending for the rest of the year. Chief Administrative Officer Richard W. Smith said that all agencies and department heads can. Based on new spending cuts and projected revenue increases, he said, there will be a savings of \$3,047,400 in the 1980-81 fiscal budget. County Supervisor John Flynn of Oxnard said, "It took an hour of this

"clear consensus" in the committee. Monday the jump in aid was decided upon after intelligence reports indicated insurgents were missing for another offensive, and the arms need. But the consensus collapsed when El Salvador.

above \$20 million in economic and military assistance already granted. The U.S. military aid will come in the form of equipment such as helicopters and machine guns. Acting Assistant Secretary of State (Continued on A-2, Col. 3)



Municipal Court Judge Burt Henson allowed cameras into the courtroom this morning for a hearing involving the Rev. Donald Patrick Rains of Thousand Oaks, second from right, standing with his attorney, Bruce Mayfield.

Priest to plead no contest to child molesting

By Gregg Zoroya
A Thousand Oaks priest said this morning he will plead no contest to molesting a minor at a semi-private

of child abuse cases by private doctors. The clause drew considerable fire from the medical profession and Rains has since decided to try to change the law. The KABC-TV station is also seeking a permanent at that portion of the bill, Rains said. According to court documents filed

Anti-Rains TV editorial blocked

Judge signs order barring station from airing charges

Ventura County Superior Court Judge Charles McGrath Monday signed a court order sought by state attorney D-Ventura, that KABC-TV station from airing an editorial scheduled for Monday evening. KABC-TV officials were not available for comment.

the result of new county spending controls.

The county supervisors imposed the hiring freeze Jan. 27, and directed agency and department heads to work with the Chief Administrative Office in cutting back spending for the rest of the year.

Chief Administrative Officer Richard Wittenberg said all agencies and department heads cooperated in the spending control plan. Based on new spending cuts and projected revenue increases, he said, there will be a savings of \$5,047,400 in the 1980-81 fiscal budget.

County Supervisor John Flynn of Oxnard said, "It ends up kind of like rewriting the budget."

In a memo to supervisors, Wittenberg said, "Our approach was to set up standards for determining adjusted spending levels and apply them to all agencies and departments."

Neither Wittenberg nor other county officials would identify where the cuts had been made.

"We don't want agencies shooting at one another," explained Board Chairman Jim Dougherty of Simi Valley.

Dougherty and Wittenberg claimed county agency heads might complain if a breakdown indicated more cutbacks had been required of their department than others.

Wittenberg said the cuts involve elimination of some "major purchas-

ing the hiring freeze and spending control plan were originally imposed because supervisors feared dramatic cutbacks in state and federal revenues during the next year. Based on Gov. Edmund G. Brown Jr.'s proposed budget, supervisors had predicted funding decreases ranging from \$9 million to \$23 million.

Board member Ed Jones of Thousand Oaks said this morning the effect of state revenue cuts is still unclear. He said specific figures can't be drawn from "the smoke-screen budget of Governor Brown."

Peter Pedroff, county budget analyst, said most of the \$5 million savings occurred as a result of attrition and the replacement of employees who quit work with other employees at a lower pay level.

He said no across-the-board percentage cuts were made in county agency budgets.

While he acknowledged that new spending limits essentially create a new budget, Pedroff said the old budget is still legally effective. That was the basis for official arguments that the spending cuts would not be broken down.

"We don't have a breakdown," said Wittenberg. "...We didn't want to break it (\$5 million) down further (because) it may have been misunderstood" by agency heads.

Officials indicated, however, that cost cuts varied greatly, depending on the agency involved.

Priest to plead no contest to child molesting

By Gregg Zoroya

A Thousand Oaks priest said this morning he will plead no contest which is the same as a guilty plea in a criminal case, to felony charges of molesting three children.

The Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer 36, priest at St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church, said he would make the plea in exchange for district attorney's officials dropping five other child molestation charges against him.

The agreement between Roemer and the District Attorney's Office was revealed during a court appearance before Municipal Court Judge Bu M. Henson.

The appearance was to be a preliminary hearing, but a stipulation to waive the preliminary hearing was presented to Henson. The waiver was conditioned on an agreement by Roemer to plead no contest.

Henson ordered Roemer to appear for arraignment in Superior Court Friday. Any plea agreement would normally be entered at that time.

If Roemer pleads no contest, he could face a maximum of 10½ years in prison for the crimes.

The expressionless priest hustled his way through a dozen newspaper radio and television reporters without acknowledging any of the questions directed to him.

"We don't have any comments, comments at all," Oxnard attorney Bruce Mayfield said while escorting his client out of the building.

The priest was arrested Jan. 26 sheriff's deputies on suspicion of making "advances of a sexual nature" to a child during a catechism class.

The original complaint accused Roemer of molesting nine boys on separate occasions last year and this year. Two of the molestations occurred outside Ventura County. Three were initiated in this county, and one district attorney charges.

The ages of the victims range from 6 to 15. The three felony cases which Roemer indicated he would plead no contest occurred in January, said Deputy District Attorney Taylor.

As a result of the agreement and prior decision by district attorney officials, five counts, including misdemeanor counts, will be dropped. A sixth count was going to be dismissed anyway, Taylor said.

The families of the nine victims were informed Monday that they would not have to appear at preliminary hearing, Taylor said, indicating that the agreement had been tentatively reached that day.

Roemer remains free on a written promise to appear in court.

Teachers offered hike of 16% over 2 years

By Robin Sjogren

Ventura teachers have been offered an 8 percent cost-of-living salary increase this year and another 8 percent next year in a tentative settlement reached Sunday.

The increase this year would be retroactive to July 1.

That offer is higher than any made before by Ventura Unified School District trustees.

The last publicized offer was for 8 percent this year and from 5 to 8 percent next year, depending on state income the district might get.

Dave Stuart, president of the Ventura Unified Education Association, said the latest offer and the entire two-year agreement were well received by teachers Monday.

About 300 teachers showed up at a general meeting after school at Buena High to hear the offer, and no one voiced objections, Stuart said. "I was surprised," he added.

Teachers will be taking a ratification vote Monday. The school board is then expected to formally approve the contract.

Superintendent Patrick Rooney has said it will be a real challenge for trustees and administrators to come up with the salary money.

It will cost the district \$240,000 more to give teachers the 8 percent

this year, as opposed to the 6.5 percent given to other district employees. Rooney said trustees have not discussed increasing the salaries of other employees.

To give 8 percent this year, the board will reduce district reserves from 2 percent to 1 percent of the total budget, Rooney said.

Depending on the district's income, Rooney said, trustees may have to make budget cuts to give teachers next year's cost-of-living increase. He has already suggested trustees consider cuts next year of more than \$1 million.

In response, Stuart said, "I don't think the administrators would have agreed to this if they didn't have the money."

If the worst financial predictions come true, some budget cuts will probably have to be made, Stuart admitted. "I hope they are as far from the classroom as possible," he said.

Teachers have often said they should be a top priority in the budget. Now that they are assured the 8 percent next year, the budget can be built from that, Stuart said.

Stuart said teachers were particularly glad the contract is for two years. "I think those were the sweetest words they could hear," he said.

(Continued on A-2, Col. 2)

SILENCE USURPS PARISHIONERS

March 1981

Church stand in sex case hit

By GAIL GROSS
Daily News Staff Writer

Some parishioners are unhappy with the continuing silence by Catholic church officials in Thousand Oaks and Los Angeles on the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer, months after sheriff's investigators say his superior was notified of the priest's reported molestation of a 6-year-old boy.

molested two brothers, ages 7 and 10, and a 12-year-old boy at St. Paschal Bayton Catholic Church in Thousand Oaks.

Although Roemer, a priest for 11 years, reportedly confessed to all eight of the molestations for which he was charged, prosecutor Joseph E. Taylor Jr. said the district attorney will ask to drop five counts at the time of sentencing.

But police investigations and Roemer's reported confession have raised questions among

parishioners about the handling by church officials of information they had in late December — and perhaps as early as last September — that the priest reportedly fondled young boys for sexual gratification.

William and Barbara Sugars are among the parishioners who have been dissatisfied with the reaction of church officials.

"It seems to me like they could come off a lot better by making a statement of concern and responsibility to the com-

munity," said William Sugars, whose child attends religious classes at St. Paschal. He also is vice president for the statewide organization of Stronger Legislation Against Child Molesters, which has been monitoring such cases and compiling information on sentences.

In a taped interview with Del. Kelli McIlvain of the East Valley sheriff's station, Roemer confessed to the molestations and to struggling with homosexual feelings since his youth.

according to a "statement of fact" filed in Ventura County Superior Court by the district attorney's office.

Roemer also told the investigator that until five or six months ago he received spiritual and psychological counseling for his problem from a priest at his former parish in Santa Barbara.

Yet church officials refuse to comment on why Roemer nearly three years ago was assigned.

From page 1

to head the youth program at the Thousand Oaks church while undergoing counseling for his sexual attraction to boys.

They also could not be reached to discuss the priest's future with the church, but Roemer reportedly is able to perform daily masses outside of Thousand Oaks.

The mother of a 12-year-old boy who said Roemer had rubbed the youth's stomach and chest following a religious class informed the Rev. Calm O'Bryan, pastor of the church of the reported incident last September, said Commander Larry Kalsbeek of the East Valley sheriff's station.

He said in late December O'Bryan also was advised of the fondling of the genitals of a 6-year-old boy at a religious retreat in San Bernardino County last May.

Kalsbeek said only the second incident was reported to authorities but, in both cases, the parents felt the problem could best be handled by the church.

While many parishioners still believe Roemer's case should have remained within the church, some are unhappy with the church's continued silence on the issue and its failure to recognize the depth of the problem.

"How am I going to be guaranteed this will never happen again, that it will not happen to my child?" Sugars asked.

Sugars said parents of several of the victims are disenchanted with the lack of support by church officials for the families. They expressed belief that earlier recognition of Roemer's problem by the church could have prevented many of the molestations and the upheaval within the church.

"We're concerned about the church's role in this particular instance because the public is so naive on the subject of child molestation," Sugars said.

"It wasn't simple hiding," he added. "It wasn't simply a fancy pal. We're talking about physical contact of a sexual nature...."

3-12-81

Dear Bishop Manning

I am just sure you
are aware of the scandal
that appears in our Thousand
Oaks newspaper. in regards
to Patric Pomer, this has
got way out of control
and being a member of
St. Patrick I think it is
time for you to make a
decision on this. He admits
he is guilty, and has

5909

The issue to tell all that
went on with these 7-8
12 year Boys

The paper states that in
May of 80 Father O'Ryne
was told about Romer's
conduct and why was
he left here at St. Paschal's
and nothing done?

I think if Father O'Ryne
knew this he should
leave Thousand Oaks
as soon as possible

Thank you

REDACTED

REDACTED

Bishop Manning
1531 209th St
Los Angeles
Ca 90015

Christmas USA 15c



5911

Cardinal Timothy Manning

March 12 1981

Dear Excellency

Are you aware of what is going on in St. Patrick Church?
in Haven Park? Are you aware that the Rev Pat Plummer
is a homosexual, a child molester? Are you aware that
he was being treated for such a gross problem in
Santa Barbara before he was sent to St. Patrick
to take on the youth program? Are you aware that
Father O'Regan has known about this and did nothing?
Are you aware that when ^{REDACTED} called O'Regan he still
did nothing and now says he was too busy at the time?
Are you aware that ^{REDACTED} program the boys have shown
in Palm Springs for his own boys? What has been done for
these poor forgotten children and their families? They
are now in psychoanalysis! Their lives and families
will remember these molestations for the rest of their lives
and will be mentally and physically disturbed and ill.

These children don't want to go to church or CCD classes
any more - they were spoiled during their lives and
are angry. Can you please do something to help
you know the circumstances. I don't want to attend Mass
at St. Patrick any more either - as we have seen in a million news
papers - someone can help and help fast. I think
for many of the young people who are in the program
I have let them know the truth. In the meantime, we are doing
what we can to help the families who are so unhappy.

5907


Donald Timothy Murray

Executive Assistant

Los Angeles, Calif




Return to: 385 395 Southwestern Boulevard
Architecture USA Inc



PLEASE ADVISE CORRESPONDENT
OF YOUR CORRECT ADDRESS.
ROOM _____ STREET 1 ZONE 1

5908



THE VENTURA COUNTY STATIONS • P.O. BOX 699, VENTURA, CALIFORNIA 93002

COMMENTARY FOR MARCH 12, 1981

This commentary concerns Fr. Pat Roemer, the Thousand Oaks priest who has confessed to three counts of child molest.

This is not a defense of what he did. This commentary is on the kind of man he used to be and on the kind of man he no doubt can be again. It is a sad commentary ~~on~~ on the fact that Fr. Roemer asked for psychological help and got some while he was assigned to a Santa Barbara parish. But apparently not enough help. And for that, we are critical of his superiors who, knowing he suffered weaknesses, assigned him to a parish where temptation assaulted him at every turn.

The Catholic Hierarchy has in this country, and in other countries places called Houses of Affirmation where priests are sent for counseling, therapy, to recover from emotional burn-out, alcoholism, rehabilitation, Roemer certainly could have qualified for long term therapy, for removal from pressures.

~~Max~~ It was not made available to him nor was he ~~forxxxxxxx~~ ~~xxx~~ ordered to hospitalize himself. Nowhere in the ~~xx~~ 34-page statement of fact which the district attorney ~~gx~~ gave to the judge and to the press is there any reference to intensive counseling, to a long respite from the pressures of the work of a priest, to the condition of being a priest.

A man who went to school with Roemer, through years and years in seminaries, said ^fther^f was never any evidence of Roemer's weakness during those years and this priest-friend of his said "That's the kind of thing that all of us guys would have reported immediately if anything like that was going on ... we wouldn't have tolerated any activity of that kind."

In the 11 years or so since Fr. Roemer's ordination, his service was beyond reproach, his ~~friend~~ friend said. Until about a year ago when he seemed to undergo a ~~xx~~ kind of personality change. It followed a crisis in his life, the death of a cousin who was like a brother to him, and his closest friend.

Too late now, Fr. Roemer's friend ~~xxxxxxx~~ said, they noticed he was ~~undergoingxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ not his usual self, too


~~xxxxxxxxxx~~
VENTURA
(805) 642-8595

OXNARD
(805) 485-2123

THOUSAND OAKS
(805) 529-0688

LOS ANGELES
(213) 939-3288

5890



THE VENTURA COUNTY STATIONS • P.O. BOX 699, VENTURA, CALIFORNIA 93002

-- 2 --

late now the friend said, Fr. Roemer is wondering how he could ever do such things, and that sometimes he wishes himself dead.

You have to give him credit for something, said a woman who is not Roemer's friend no way would he put the kids he molested through another ordeal, that of a courtroom. His plea saved them that.

His friend tells us that Fr. Roemer, who is not living in Ventura County at this time, is allowed to say Mass every day and that among his greatest sorrows are the remorse for his reprehensible actions, for the anguish he's caused his ~~family~~ family and all his former classmates at Oxnard's Santa Clara High, and for the horrendous publicity the ~~Catholic~~ Catholic church suffers because of him.

Both ~~his~~ his friend and his non-friend said "There's a man who really needs our prayers."

This is Margaret McKean

5891

VENTURA
(805) 642-8595

OXNARD
(805) 485-2123

THOUSAND OAKS
(805) 529-0688

LOS ANGELES
(213) 939-3288

Dear Cardinal Manning

I hope and pray all goes
well for you!

I simply wanted to ex-
press my thanks again to
you for coming to celebrate

REDACTED

Mass of Resurrection
last Saturday. I realize you
came because you deeply
love for all your priests, but
I just needed to add my own
personal gratitude because he
was my very dear friend

REDACTED

REDACTED

and our whole family
was so happy that you came.

REDACTED

facts are being finally
unleashed. Have both good and
bad days, I guess, - all

5905



part of the grief process. So do
I! But we all trust and have
faith. Well! - the old dumbbell
and phone are *Heart* going - so
I will leave. *That's*
May all go well for you!

Sincerely *

Pot Roemer



Respectfully,

H303

5906

Monday morning.

Dear Cardinal Manning,

I just wanted to write
you "hello!" and hope that
it goes well for you!

Especially, I am so
grateful for your kindness
and support to me when
I came to see you that
day. I've experienced some
very rough days, but the
love and love of the Lord
through you has helped me
accept and understand these
experiences much better.

I have been living
mostly at the penitentiary

College, and visiting the
penitentiary to do some work for
a couple of hours each day.
Monsignor Casade told me
today that, (because of the
court, I think), I have to
go to a "monastery." He ar-
ranged for Sierra made so
I'll be there until my
preliminary court day of Feb. 1971.
I sure miss my parish & all the
wonderfully supportive people, but
I clearly understand. I am
also going to Dr. REDACTED
at the Excelsior REDACTED
Clinic 2 days a week. He
is really excellent! He's a
new member of St Paschalis'
community. REDACTED and

REDACTED

took on with
them on a good day off up
to the Union head. They
are very close friends.

I just wanted to tell
you thanks and let you
know, as "they" say - "what's
happening"! Thanks again
for your understanding, patience,
concern & goodness. I am
very much grateful -

In love and,

Pat Roemer

Warmest
personal
regards™

FROM ARGUS

5903



What appears
to be the end
may really
be a new
beginning.

5904

REDACTED

March 15th

REDACTED

Dear Father

As I sat in church this morning feeling very anxious, I knew I must express my feelings directly. I thought putting it on paper might be best as I could put my thoughts in order, taking the time to clearly think them out.

As you probably have read, my husband and I are involved in the organization called S.L.A.M. (Stronger Legislation Against Child Molesters). Since our involvement with this group we have learned quite a bit about the problem and just how widespread it is.

We have learned that no one knows the cause or the cure — perhaps just how to keep it under control and unfortunately only a few percentage of molesters have been able to do that. So without knowing what causes it or how to cure it our only option as parents and concerned citizens is to prevent it from happening in anyway we can.

Probably the most important aspect in reducing molestations is education. We must learn as much as possible about child molesting — what pattern the pedophile follows, what signs we as parents and citizens might be aware of and the fact

it can happen in any walk of life. Most often it is done by someone the child knows. Too many have the misconception that the act is done by a "stranger grabbing children off the street". This is not just a problem of the Catholic church; it's a problem that everyone needs to be made aware of.

I have heard you speak about the fact that we should not seek revenge and I agree - revenge does not solve the problem. But change need to be made so this does not happen again - not just at St. Paschal's but any parish. Our children have a right to be protected

and we as parents must speak for them.

I feel poor judgment was exercised by failing to remove Father Roemer from his position after the first incident was reported. With an accusation of such a serious nature, one must not let other children possibly become potential victims while the matter is being investigated. This could be handled in a discreet manner until such facts are proven.

What good are mistakes if we don't learn from them. We should all work together - the Church and community - to try and find solutions so we might help reduce this

violation to our children. I would like to see new guideline written within the Church laws on how to handle such an incident if it should re occur in any parish. Perhaps you could use your influence to effect such changes.

As far as Father Roemer is concerned, I truly hope he is part of the small percentage that can keep his problem under control. He is a man of talents and could put them to use in so many areas other than with children.

Most important of all, let's remember our responsibility to our children. Too often the victims carry their

scars into adulthood. Let's all look ahead and try to find solutions. If the Catholic Church wants to do their part in preventing this matter from happening again and would like to speak to people who have expertise on the subject, my husband and I would be glad to supply you with a list of names.

In closing there is still one unanswered question. Being friends with the family of one of the victims we have witnessed and shared their emotions and hurt throughout this unpleasant situation. They too are not vengeful people but are very perplexed as to why

they have not had any
inquiries from the Church
as to their well being or
that of their children. They
feel really let down. I
don't have an answer for
them.

REDACTED and I are hoping to
hear from you.

Sincerely

REDACTED

No answers on priest

News Chronicle
March 18

Church officials mum on allowing cleric to work with youths

By FAYE FIORE

Local Catholic Church leaders are refusing to comment on why a Conejo priest was made youth minister at his Thousand Oaks parish while he was undergoing counseling for his homosexual attraction to children.

The silence by administrators at St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church and the Catholic Archdiocese of Los Angeles is both frustrating and disquieting to a young Thousand Oaks couple whose two children were molested by the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer.

The story of the popular priest, who admits molesting boys who attended the church for Bible instruction, is just beginning to unfold even for the victims.

Now, they are looking with amazement at evidence which states the 36-year-old priest was fighting a homosexual attraction to children and receiving psychological counseling from another clergyman at the San Roque Catholic Church in Santa Barbara, where he was assigned before coming to St. Paschal's three years ago.

Evidence shows that Roemer was receiving counseling up until "four or five months ago," well into the time he was actively working with children attending Bible study classes at St. Paschal's and taking some on weekend retreats.

The information means that Roemer was seeking psychological care at the time he received the 1980 Honorary Service Award from the PTA for his work with Conejo youth.

An obviously pained Roemer indicated in a confession he made to East Valley sheriff's deputies hours after his arrest that he had been "fighting and fighting" his attraction to young boys.

Placing such a troubled man in a setting with children is much like locking an alcoholic in a liquor store and saying, "Don't drink," the parents of two of the victims agree.

Contacted this morning at St. Paschal's, the Rev. Colm O'Ryan was asked by the News Chronicle why Roemer was assigned as youth minister where parishioners say he rarely associated with adults. "I have no comment," was his only reply.

The pastor also refused to be interviewed by deputies during the investigation, records reveal.

The Rev. Clement Connolly, secretary to Cardinal Timothy Manning at the archdiocese, also refused to comment, saying it would violate the "confidentiality" of Roemer's counseling.

"This is obviously a very delicate matter and the confidentiality of his counseling is highly delicate," he said.

Connolly would not say whether Roemer's private attorney, Bruce Mayfield, is being paid out of church funds or by the priest.

In addition, he would release no information about what Roemer's future in the priesthood might be now that he must register as a sex offender. Roemer currently is not assigned to any parish and is "in private," Connolly said.

Tuesday night, the Millers (not the family's real name) sat in their living room reflecting on the turmoil of the recent weeks since their 7-year-old son told them Roemer molested him.

"We are angry and a little bitter," the boy's father said upon hearing prosecutors' evidence that church officials had several chances to remedy the problem, and let each go by.

As early as Dec. 27, a Newbury Park woman avoided pressing charges against the priest after he allegedly molested her 6-year-old son.

Interested only in seeing that the well-loved Roemer received help, the woman called St. Paschal's acting pastor O'Ryan on Dec. 27 and Jan. 30.

According to the woman's statements to investigators, O'Ryan promised her that the problem would be "thoroughly handled," offering this analogy: "It's like having a splinter in your thumb; if something isn't done about it, it continues to get worse."

In the next four weeks, three more children were molested by the priest — the three counts to which he essentially pleaded guilty in court.

Two of those three counts involved the Millers' sons.

The family has considered leaving the parish, feeling slighted by church leaders and some of its members.

"If a church isn't going to back its people, then what is a church?" the mother said.

Their report to deputies provided an inlet that led to a wave of similar complaints, all from children and families who knew of the priest's actions but did not come forward, often out of guilt or fear.

After the arrest, the parents were preoccupied with what the effects of the incident might be — whether their sons would be psychologically harmed by the encounters, if the children would feel guilty because "Father Pat" had to leave the parish or if they would blame their parents for calling deputies.

All of that, they now realize with anger,

could have been avoided if the situation was better handled by church officials. "I think they acted poorly," the father said.

O'Ryan called the family only once after the incidents, the couple said, and that was to request that they not speak with the press.

Although the couple was informed that some members of the church were praying both for Roemer and the children, they said the small amount of support was not enough to offset the bitter response from community members who accused them of having too little faith in their parish to keep the matter within the church and out of the hands of deputies.

The Millers feel that church leaders and some parishioners were more concerned about protecting Roemer than about the welfare of the children.

"At first, I felt sorry for Father Roemer," the mother said. "But it kept going on longer with no support for the victims — all of it went to the suspect."

The woman said that five days after Roemer was arrested, she took her son to church to make his first confession, a Catholic ceremony that children practice weeks for.

"Father Roemer wasn't there and I just broke down," she said. "I felt guilty and (her son) was disappointed because he had rehearsed with Father Pat."

The letters published on the News Chronicle editorial page did not ease the disquietude. The Millers said they even saw a critical letter from a friend who was unaware that she knew the family.

She said the faultfinding parishioners spoke without knowing the difficulty of trying to prepare their children to testify, before Roemer's no contest plea saved them from taking the stand. They were unaware that she dreaded that the boys would have to face Roemer, whom they, too, loved, and point him out in court as a child molester.

Tuesday was the couple's first opportunity to voice the anger they withheld for weeks as they read the letters that chastised them and called for publication of the name of their son — knowing the priest had already confessed.

"I am so angry that people would think my 7-year-old is a liar," the mother said. "They were upset that we went to the police because Father Pat showed a little too much affection."

"They didn't understand that besides our children being victims of a child molest and what all of this did to our family, that we, too, lost Father Pat."

OUR LADY OF LOURDES CHURCH

March 19, 1981

3772 EAST THIRD STREET •

• LOS ANGELES 63, CALIF.



Dear Cardinal Timothy,

I wrote a letter to our Brother Priest Father D. Pat Roemer expressing my concern and love for him offering my prayers and friendships in his difficult situation.

REDACTED I spoke with my REDACTED REDACTED and he was generous in offering our assistance if needed. If it should come to his requiring professional help, we offer our monastery in Shawnee, Oklahoma as a possibility. Or we could pursue the possibility of St. Benedict's in Atchison, Kansas which is close to Kansas City, which my REDACTED stated that there is better professional help available there.

I know that as our Archbishop you are doing all you can to help Father Roemer at this time and this offer is only to give you another alternative. I hope this does not sound presumptuous, but is written out of real concern for Fr. Roemer.

May I take this occasion to ask for your continued prayers for our Parish Renewal weekends and forgiveness if I have been critical of you indirectly by criticizing some of your appointees. I appreciate more my union and love for you as my bishop measures my union and love for Christ Himself. In the Lord Jesus,

Fr. REDACTED

5887

REDACTED

March 20, 1981

Cardinal Timothy Manning.

Dear Father:-

We have a scandal in our area. It could have been handled much better, but instead of placing the priest in trouble, in a position not involving boys and getting him the help he needed, he was still allowed to stay where he was with the boys. Fr. Roemer should have been transferred immediately, when the priest in charge was notified some time ago about their son's "experience," by the parents. Now we have this "mess" and all the good, sincere priests must suffer.

Many years ago, I had a similar experience, when one of my sons were young. I notified the priest's superiors. The priest was removed immediately and given help.

5872

- 2 -

The spiritual welfare of these young boys should have first priority! As a concerned Grandmother of 38 and great Grandmother of 33, I am forced to speak up at this time.

You said the funeral Mass for
 REDACTED Fr. REDACTED, a few
 years ago at Blessed Sacrament Church.

I am asking you to see that our boys are protected from the priests with this type of weakness.

Thank you,

REDACTED

5873

REDACTED

March 20, 1981

Judge Shaw
 c/o Joe Taylor
 Office of the District Attorney
 Hall of Justice
 800 South Victoria Avenue
 Ventura, California 93009

ATTACHMENT #3

Your Honor:

The case before you concerning Father Pat Roemer is very much on my mind. In fact, as the mother of one of the victims, REDACTED I have found it increasingly difficult to put this matter out of my mind, and yet I am trying to do that.

There are a few things I would like you to know as you hear this case, and I can speak only for my own family, and the effects on us. I am relieved not to have had to appear in court and not to have had my son undergo the further problems that I feel would have certainly resulted from his having to testify. Even so, I think it is best that you understand the consequences of this situation, at least in our family - and, I strongly suspect, to varying degrees in each of the victim families, because of the emotional shock of a sexual encounter at such a tender age.

REDACTED was only six when he had this unfortunate sexual encounter with Father Roemer. He has been deeply involved in his own Christian life for several years. We were all very proud when he passed his First Communion test at the age of five. He made his First Communion that year, which is about three years early, but he was very involved with Jesus.

I'm not trying to paint him as the picture of a perfect kid. He's had his share of problems. When his grandfather died we had quite a problem with him for awhile. He was angry and resentful. This was the only grandfather he had known. But this period of time had been followed by such an upswing, with his behavior turning around and his cheerful attitude returning. And so, it was confusing to us after our family retreat that when we arrived at Mass he would sit there with his seat belt on and say, "Please, just let me wait in the car. I don't want to go in. I'll behave out here. Just please let me sit in the car." But he wouldn't explain, and we couldn't understand, and so we made him join us each week. He wouldn't listen; he wouldn't pay attention. His attitude became irreverent. He started having problems in school: arguing, kicking, being rude. He became as inconsiderate and rude at home as any little boy who had never been special, or known how to behave. It was bewildering.

Finally, just before Christmas vacation, his teacher called me and said that his attitude was just getting worse, not better, and that she didn't know and couldn't seem to find out what his problem was, but that she was sure it was important for us to find out. She had seen such a decline in his behavior, in his attitude, and certainly in his grades, that she was afraid he was only marginally passing. This is the same child who had skipped a grade and still received nearly straight A's in the first quarter. He ranks in the 90th percentile in the National Individual Test Record scores for this year. So

his teacher asked me to really work on the problem over the Christmas vacation. He maintained consistently that he didn't know why he wasn't behaving, while he proceeded to do things he had never done before: carving deep pictures on furniture, writing on walls, tearing up pictures - and no amount of discipline slowed him down.

We had a great day on Christmas, and finally, Christmas night, after the boys were tucked in, the two boys said their prayers, and as I started to leave the room, REDACTED's little voice came out - "I hope God will forgive me for doing something terrible." I went back and sat on the edge of the bed, asking him what he meant. He told me that he had done something so terrible he was afraid to tell me. I reassured him that he could tell me anything without being afraid. I took him out to the family room, sat him in my lap and asked for him to explain to me what was bothering him so much. He became increasingly more upset as he related to me the details of what had happened to him on that retreat. I didn't want to believe him...and yet, I knew by the way he was talking that he was letting go of a burden he had carried alone for a long time, that it was, indeed, the truth, and that it was still bothering him.

The one thing he said that really hurt, because it made me feel that he hadn't been able to trust anyone, even me, enough to tell what had happened earlier, was that he didn't tell us because "I knew no one would believe me, because we all love Father Roemer so much that you wouldn't believe he would do something so bad. And I didn't tell you because I know I'm not too young to go to jail for something like this. I thought if I just forgot about it, it would go away. It doesn't go away. Now it's always in my head unless I'm talking. It's always there. What's wrong with me?" And when he asked me what was wrong with him, it really shook me up, because I knew that he had been sending out signs of needing help, and that I had reacted to his misbehavior with anger, frustration and resentment, and all of the adult things we feel when someone doesn't act the way we expect them to. I had let him down when he needed me most.

REDACTED is having therapy now. It's been a hard decision not to take this into court to have the church pay for his therapy. After all, we didn't cause this problem; it's not fair for us to shoulder the financial burden of its repair. And yet, he is our son, and we want him to have the best opportunities in life, and that includes good emotional health. I feel that a civil proceeding would increase the trauma for him - and, in fact, for our entire family. The cost has its own reward as we see him, even with his small improvements, gradually calming a little, listening when spoken to, and behaving less violently. I feel very fortunate that we have received such support from the District Attorney's office, because we certainly haven't gotten it from our church.

REDACTED have all acted with such gentleness and concern for the family, keeping us informed, protecting us from the media insanity, that I have gained a great deal of respect for just what the District Attorney does for us. The compassion and support you would have expected to come from the parish level is coming from the DA!

For myself, the most difficult thing to accept in all of this is not that Father Roemer has done something terrible. Each of us has done something terrible at one time or another. He needs help. To me, that's more than obvious. He's in our prayers right along with our own son, who also needs help, and is getting it. We hope that Father is also getting help. I am

also praying for my own ability to overcome the shock of the incident. It has left me with the feeling that I cannot protect my own children, and that is scary. REDACTED heads out for school, and I don't want him to go, I don't know who's out there - maybe somebody we don't know, maybe somebody we think is a friend. I just pray that he'll come home each day without having had any more problems. God knows he's had enough. And right now, I feel that we have, too.

I hope you understand the motivation behind this letter. I understand that the next court appearance is on April 14th. Our baby is due REDACTED, and perhaps the timing is a blessing, as it will give a new focus to our family, as we try to put this entire episode behind us. It will be good to see a legal conclusion to this. I pray for God's guidance for you as you hear this case.

Sincerely,
REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

March 21, 1981

Cardinal Timothy Manning
 1531 West 9th Street
 Los Angeles, California 90015

Your Holiness:

The last few months have been most bewildering to me as a Catholic. If this letter accomplishes nothing more than to clear this burden from my heart, it will have succeeded its most important duty. The problem I would like to speak with you about is that concerning Father Fat Roemer. As the mother of REDACTED one of the little victims, I have found it increasingly difficult to put this matter out of my mind, and yet I am trying to do that.

There are a few things I would like you to know as you offer guidance in this case. I can speak only for my own family and the effects on us, but perhaps you can extend this to the fourteen families and fifteen victims now known to be involved to differing degrees. I am relieved not to have had to appear in court, and not to have had my son undergo the further problems that I feel would have certainly resulted from his having to testify. Even so, I feel it is best that you understand the consequences of this situation, and the parish's apparent attitude, because of the emotional shock of a sexual encounter at such a tender age.

REDACTED was only six when he suffered this unfortunate sexual encounter with Father Roemer. Evidence indicates that his was one of the most serious of the molestations, having emotional consequences we are trying to deal with. REDACTED has been deeply involved in his own Christian life for several years. We were all very proud when he passed his First Communion test at the age of five. He made his First Communion on Easter Sunday that year, about three years early. This Easter, we will be lucky just to get him in the church with no complaints.

I'm not trying to paint him as the picture of a perfect kid. He's had his share of problems. When his grandfather died, we had quite a problem with him for awhile. He was angry and resentful. This was the only grandfather he had known. But this period of time had been followed by such an upswing, with his behavior turning around and his cheerful attitude returning. And so, it was confusing to us after our family retreat that when we arrived at Mass he would sit there with his seat belt on and say, "Please, just let me wait in the car. I don't want to go in. I'll behave out here. Just please let me sit in the car." But he wouldn't explain, and we couldn't understand, and so we made him join us each week. He wouldn't listen; he wouldn't pay attention. His attitude became irreverent. He started having problems in school: arguing, kicking, being rude. He became as inconsiderate and rude at home as any little boy who had never been special, or known how to behave. It was bewildering.

Finally, just before Christmas vacation, his teacher called me and said that his attitude was just getting worse, not better, and that she didn't know and couldn't seem to find out what his problem was, but that she was sure it was important for us to find out. She had seen such a decline in his behavior, in his attitude, and certainly in his grades, that she was afraid he was only

marginally passing. This is the same child who had skipped a grade and still received nearly straight A's in the first quarter. He ranks in the 90th percentile in the National Individual Test Record scores for this year. So his teacher asked me to really work on the problem over the Christmas vacation. REDACTED maintained consistently that he didn't know why he wasn't behaving, while he proceeded to do things he had never done before: carving deep pictures on furniture, writing on walls, tearing up pictures - and no amount of discipline slowed him down.

We had a great day on Christmas, and finally, Christmas night, after the boys were tucked in, the two boys said their prayers, and as I started to leave the room, REDACTED's little voice came out - "I hope God will forgive me for doing something terrible." I went back and sat on the edge of the bed, asking him what he meant. He told me that he had done something so terrible he was afraid to tell me. I reassured him that he could tell me anything without being afraid. I took him out to the family room, sat him in my lap and asked for him to explain to me what was bothering him so much. He became increasingly more upset as he related to me the details of what had happened to him on that retreat. I didn't want to believe him...and yet, I knew by the way he was talking that he was letting go of a burden he had carried alone for a long time, and that it was, indeed, the truth - and obviously still bothering him.

The one thing he said that really hurt, because it made me feel that he hadn't been able to trust anyone, even me, enough to tell what had happened earlier, was that he didn't tell us because, "I knew no one would believe me, because we all love Father Roemer so much that you wouldn't believe he would do something so bad. And I didn't tell you because I know I'm not too young to go to jail for something like this. I thought if I just forgot about it, it would go away. It doesn't go away. Now it's always in my head unless I'm talking. It's always there. What's wrong with me?" And when he asked me what was wrong with him, it really shook me up, because I knew that he had been sending out signs of needing help, and that I had reacted to his misbehavior with anger, frustration and resentment, and all of the adult things we feel when someone doesn't act the way we expect them to. I had let him down when he needed me the most.

REDACTED is having therapy on a weekly basis now. It's been a hard decision not to take this into court to have the church pay for his therapy. After all, we didn't cause the problem; it's not fair for us to shoulder the financial burden of its repair. Our insurance covers all but \$380.00 for the first 30 weeks, then it stops. His counselor believes that we can accomplish all or nearly all that is needed in this time frame. The financial support offered by our parish priest, Fr. REDACTED, was withdrawn after therapy had begun, and that was another shock to the system. What has my church been teaching me all these years? To turn its back on the innocent victims in favor of protecting someone who is already in all of our prayers? Our medical bills are now higher than our food bills. REDACTED

REDACTED

And yet, REDACTED is our son, and we want him to have the best opportunities in life, and that includes good emotional health. I feel that a civil

proceeding would increase the trauma for him - and, in fact, for our entire family. The cost of REDACTED's therapy has its own reward as we see him, even with his small improvements, gradually calming a little, listening when spoken to, and behaving less violently. I feel very fortunate that we have received such support from the District Attorney's office, because we most certainly haven't gotten it from our church. The people in the District Attorney's office have acted consistently with such gentleness to REDACTED, and concern for the family, keeping us informed, protecting us from the media insanity, that I have gained a great deal of respect for just what the District Attorney does for us. The compassion and support you would have expected to come from the parish level is coming from the DA!

For myself, the most difficult thing to accept in all of this is not that Father Roemer has done something terrible. Each of us has done something terrible at one time or another. He needs help. To me, that is more than obvious. He's in our prayers right along with our own son, who also needs help, and is getting it. We hope that Father is also getting help. I am also praying for my own ability to overcome the shock of the incident. It has left me with the feeling that I cannot protect my own children, and that is scary. REDACTED heads out for school, four blocks away, and I don't want him to go. I don't know who's out there - maybe somebody we don't know, maybe somebody we think is a friend. I just pray that he'll come home each day without having had any more problems. God knows he's had enough. And right now, I feel that we have, too.

I hope you understand the motivation behind this letter. I have met you a few times through REDACTED and when you Confirmed my high school CCD class year before last. As spiritual leader for us all, your complete knowledge is very valuable. The only time any church member has contacted me was to request that I not speak with the news media. My husband and I believe that this does not reflect your attitude, or the true meaning of the Catholic church. I pray for God's guidance for you as you consider helping the families and victims with their healing process, as we all try to find a new focus for the family, putting this episode behind us. God bless and guide you...

Sincerely,

REDACTED

March 24, 1981

REDACTED

Dear REDACTED

20th to Cardinal Manning.

which you have expressed.

us.

Thank you for your kind letter of March

We appreciate and share the concerns

Please keep a prayerful remembrance for

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

5871

March 24, 1981

Reverend REDACTED
Our Lady of Lourdes Church
3772 East Third Street
Los Angeles, California 90063

Dear Father REDACTED

His Eminence, Cardinal Manning, has asked that I respond with his gratitude to your kind letter of March 19, concerning Father Roemer.

Please extend our appreciation to your REDACTED
Father REDACTED for his concern and helpful suggestions.

With kindest best regards, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Reverend Monsignor John A. Rawden
Chancellor

REDACTED

5886



no answer
 REDACTED

REDACTED

March 24, 1981

Dear REDACTED

We met one Sunday after Mass at Sacred Heart church in Ventura. I am a member of Our Lady of Assumption but sometimes attend Mass at Sacred Heart, hoping to have not only my hour with God but a moment or two with Fr. REDACTED

I am sending to you a radio editorial I did on a subject which has caused all of us so much anguish -- since it aired, I have been accused of being "soft" on Fr. R because I am Catholic and/ or because my son, REDACTED who lived in Thousand Oaks is a friend of Fr. R's. The reason I wrote and aired the ~~edit-
 irlaxixxxxx~~ is neither of those. The reason for it is that I join many Catholics in our concern that a young priest is allowed to try to work out his problems with either no help or minimal help. One of my sources tells me that the pastor at St. Paschal Baylon had been told earlier ~~by~~ by parents who did not go to the police of their son's molestation. If there was an investigation it was not intensive enough, and Fr. R. remained in a situation he could not manage. I would be most interested in hearing from you.

Thank you for your consideration, and God bless you during this time of this horrendous travail,

Sincerely, REDACTED

REDACTED

Form PP-217 © The Drawing Board, Inc., Box 505, Dallas, Texas

5889

March 25, 1981

Dear Judge Shaw,

These are my feelings about where I am now, and where I would hope to be in the future. I find it difficult to make this statement: maybe this is a symbol of my overall problem-- avoidance. I have not adequately faced some deep issues in my life and done something about them.

Some time ago I realized that I had a sexual attraction to young boys and adolescents which was not normal. This really scared me, and I did confide my fears and described my problem to a priest-confidante in Santa Barbara. At first, I felt I was handling it well, but later when my attraction became too strong for me to suppress, and I actually did molest a child, I stopped facing the problem. Although I had feelings of guilt and disgust, I avoided doing anything specific about it. I am not sure why I didn't, except that I felt very fearful and embarrassed, and maybe felt that I would be removed from parish work, which was my whole life. I know now what a disaster this was, my avoidance, my not taking appropriate measures to definitely correct this problem.

When I was called into the sheriff's office on January 26, I knew it was over in the sense that I was forced to clearly confront this problem and do something about it. As I look back on my confession and those incidents, I very deeply regret any harm my actions caused to those children. I know that I have a real talent and gift for working with children, and I do deeply care about them. But I also feel very badly that I took advantage of their trust and love for me and that this could cause serious harm to them. I worry a lot about this now, and I am truly sorry!

I still have a deep concern for children and their welfare. I also have a clear understanding that as long as my present problem continues, I should not be in a position to work with children. I am completely open to this reality.

Some people have stated that they thought most of my parish involvement was with children. This is not true. I did a great deal of work with adults - their education, needs, concerns and problems. I can see now that working with adults could be the thrust for my future ministry. I am totally open to anything the court and church decides in this regard.

Most of all, I am open to the personal re-evaluation and rehabilitation I must go through in my psychological counseling. Once all the court proceedings and sentencing are completed, I still am left with myself. Therefore, the most difficult and painful part has already begun, facing my personal problems and doing something about them. Since January 26th, I have seen a psychologist twice a week. I feel I am growing, and can grow, and must grow into a more integrated and authentic person with this continuing help. This is the most painful and challenging part: to no longer avoid major issues in my life that affect myself and others, but to face them and deal with them. This is my present and future home!

Donald Patrick Roemer

Earlier molest complaint was filed against priest

By FAYE FIORE

She was up until 1 a.m. today, concerned about the tone of the letters in the newspaper.

She's read the comments from faithful supporters who cannot fathom the idea that Father Donald Patrick Roemer was arrested for charges of child molesting.

But she views the case from a different perspective. Her son, she says, was also molested by the 36-year-old St. Paschal Baylon priest.

The young Newbury Park woman contacted the News Chronicle late this morning to say that her family filed a complaint with the Ventura County Sheriff's Department last December after their son, then 6 years old, was allegedly sexually molested by Roemer.

Authorities confirmed today that such a complaint was filed with them in December.

What most disturbs the young woman, who insisted she not be identified, is that the clergyman's supporters have blindly refused to accept the possibility that a man she says she, too, respects is less than perfect.

"The input I wanted to give," she said in a slow, even voice, "is that this is a man I can't even be angry with. I see him as being very sick and in need of help, but he also gives so much help.

"He has done so much good, and one bad thing doesn't cancel all of that."

Supporters who insist upon Roemer's innocence in fervent letters to the News Chronicle are placing an unfair burden upon his shoulders by refusing to accept that he is capable of a human flaw, the woman said. The community response so disturbed her, she said, that she decided to call the newspaper.

"People who are writing these letters are making it sound like he has to be innocent because if he isn't, he's no good," she said. "He knows they have a false confidence in him to be perfect and they are not giving him any slack at all."

This morning, Roemer pleaded not guilty to a child molesting charge during an

arraignment in Ventura Municipal Court.

The newspaper and sheriff's department have both been the target of criticism by local parishioners with unwavering confidence in his innocence. They have chastised the media for publishing the report of his arrest.

The woman said she and her husband contacted the Child Abuse, Neglect and Protection Clinic in Ventura after the incident, the details of which she was careful not to discuss to avoid jeopardizing the court case.

The clinic reportedly told her that a child of 6 or 7 years of age does not have the creative capacity to invent the detailed sexual encounter described.

Vocal critics have alleged that the child manufactured the story and that many of the men involved in the church are now apprehensive about working with children.

"I know the charges are true," she said. "I don't know if there is a third or a fourth victim, but I know that, other than my husband, there is no man whom I would hate more to hear this about."

Since the incident, the mother said, her child's grades have fallen in school and he is unable to concentrate.

On his last report card before the incident, the youth received the equivalent of 22 out of 26 A's. This time, she says, his teacher called to warn her that he is receiving mostly C's and D's and is having particular problems in behavior.

The family is not a member of St. Paschal's parish and the alleged encounter occurred in a setting outside of the parish, she explained. When their child described the incident to them, the woman said they sought advice from St. Paschal's co-administrator, Father Colm O'Ryan.

Church officials, she was told, were instructed to speak with Roemer about the problem.

In response to bitter complaints that the sheriff's department hastily arrested the clergyman on the "word of a 7-year-old," the woman pointed out that the investigation was already proceeding last December.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Cardinal Manning
 FROM: REDACTED
 DATE: April 1, 1981
 RE: The attached

I would have preferred a brief note of understanding support somewhat along the following lines:

Dear REDACTED

"The Cardinal has asked me to respond to your kind letter. By all means we perfectly understand the financial burdens which have beset you in these difficult days.

We are attaching a check for \$500.00. This hopefully will assist you in paying for your maternity costs which are surely exorbitant.

Your genuine concern for the Church, its ministers and its people is deeply appreciated. We shall indeed keep a prayerful remembrance for you."

I have indicated in my letter a check for \$500.00 since this steers away from the precise figure of \$380.00 requested for compensation.

One other disadvantage is that REDACTED letter introduces the idea of a contest between two parties and your obligation to support the priests.

REDACTED

REDACTED

will give you a check.

REDACTED

REDACTED

Rev. Donald P. Roemer

(April 1981)

St. Mary's Seminary
1964 Las Canoas Road
Santa Barbara 93105

Phone: 1-805) 966-4829

5885



1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015

April 1, 1981

Father Patrick Roemer

Dear Pat,

on a few occasions I tried to reach you by phone, but either there was no answer or a busy signal.

My only reason for writing is to continue to reassure you that you are in our thoughts and prayers. I suspect the deep hurts that plague you and the need for understanding & compassion.

Should you at any time wish to visit me I will be most happy to see you. In any event you are in my daily prayers.

Devotedly

5884

Justin Cardinal Manning

Thursday p.m. Apr. 2, 1981

Dear Cardinal Manning,

I just received your letter, and my day became much brighter! "I really appreciate hearing from you"; I am very grateful for your shared sentiments.

"Things" seem to be going fairly well as of late. Two and three weeks ago, I felt very badly, especially because of all the local (Doo & Doo & Doo) negative publicity. I feel as lucky however, that Mrs. [REDACTED] is still so supportive.

[REDACTED] has also been great to me, and so very helpful. I manage to try and stay active as I drive to Doo several times weekly to see my lawyer (a very good man!) and twice weekly to see [REDACTED]

my psychologist (also good!) This area is so peaceful, quiet, comfortable and very beautiful. I have a chance some nights to visit [REDACTED] from my former 2 [REDACTED] here (St. Raphael's & St. D. 2)

[REDACTED]

REDACTED

REDACTED

82

I was very this, but I am
 also open to that experience as a possi-
 bility. I told REDACTED my
 guess that I would decide that - and
 I'd like to discuss that with you
 sometime, - at least your general feeling
 about that. I feel I'd like to explain
 clearly about some of those persons I
 have heard that have gotten around -
 that I previously went to United Operations
 and told of my "problems," and that
 nothing was done. This is such a distortion.
 Maybe I could personally share with you
 about the meaning of that. I also had
 to make a concise statement to Judge
 Shaw of "where I am at" now. It was

5882

P 3

a very different thing to do. It becomes a public document in 2 more weeks, and before the public press gets it. I'd like you to see it. Right now, my probation officer and the judge are reading and the many support letters I have received and writing them as references.

Thanks for patiently reading over all this. I needed a professional to share it all with you. May I please have an appointment with you, at your convenience?

Once again, I am so happy you wrote me. I hope and pray all the best for you! May the Lord continue to bless you in every way possible.

Sincerely and Gratefully,

Cat Racine

5883

REDACTED

April 2, 1981

REDACTED
 Per. REDACTED

Dear Father,

The answer you gave to my troubled letter in regards to Fr. D. P. Roemer and the scandal at our church was a complete shock to me and my entire family.

Nowadays a sincere Catholic does not know who to turn to for spiritual help.

With the "mass" our Mass is now, so little reverence, more like a "town hall meeting". Men and women all over the altar, so much hand clapping, as if at a show. Very little reverence for the tabernacle pushed over in the corner out of the way, the altar stripped of the railing. The goblets of wine, being possessed by men and women, even the Host. "Take

5867

-2-

it in the Hand" is the spirit of the day. No kneeling, to receive the sacred Host. Instead of kneeling and preparing ourselves to receive Our Blessed Lord, we are busy shaking hands with every body, "Peace be to you", when there is no peace, only confusion. I see where some churches have Celtic girls, replacing altar boys. Why?

The sacrament of Penance has been stripped of its true meaning. There used to be long lines going to Confession, now hardly any people go. I have talked to many about this. Especially the young, they said "they won't go to this new type".

Another "mess" our brilliant Bishops have done to destroy our beloved faith; in this healing sacrament.

We have many enemies outside the church, we have plenty inside.

There is so much more. I could go into it but I know it would be useless. Our American Bishops defy the Pope right on T.V. I pray for the "real" priests, who are suffering with us.

5868

- 3 -

I wrote ten years ago to Cardinal Manning and it didn't do any good. He went right on "messing" up our beautiful Sacred Mass. For that he will be long remembered. I have married children in Sacramento, Big Sur, Newport Beach, Toros, San Diego and we all saw the same determination to destroy our beloved faith. I feel sorry for Cardinal Manning, he is to be pitied. We need a strong priest and all we have are weak ones. I see so many people leaving the church. I can understand why.

I thank God every day, I had the privilege to have attended all those sacred Masses, where our "real priests" offered Mass to God and brought spiritual help to the troubled people. Now all we have is a "moving town hall meeting." God helps!

Sincerely

(over)

REDACTED

5869

P.S. I am sending a copy of
this letter to the Pope.

5870

April 3, 1981

REDACTED

Dear REDACTED

The Cardinal has asked me to respond to your kind letter. By all means we perfectly understand the financial burdens which have beset you in these difficult days.

We are attaching a check for \$500.00. This hopefully will assist you in paying for your maternity costs which are surely exorbitant.

Your genuine concern for the Church, its ministers and its people is deeply appreciated. We shall indeed keep a prayerful remembrance for you.

Sincerely yours,

REDACTED

REDACTED

Enclosure

5860

Did deputies delay priest arrest?

Case 'closed' by investigator who was also a Catholic deacon

By FAYE FIORE

If the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer had not been a Catholic priest, would Ventura County sheriff's deputies have arrested him on charges of child molesting one month earlier — before his list of six victims grew to nine?

Would deputies have moved more rapidly in the case if the suspect had been just a bachelor who worked with children, instead of a clergyman?

The decision to close the investigation of the St. Baschal Baylon priest after he was accused of molesting a 6-year-old boy was made last December by a police lieutenant who also serves as a deacon in a Catholic parish, the News Chronicle has learned.

Lt. Braden McKinley said it was a "judgment call" when he opted to discontinue the investigation of the Thousand Oaks clergyman after a parent complained that her son was molested by Roemer while on a religious retreat in San Bernardino County.

One month later, Roemer confessed to nine counts of child molesting, three of which occurred after McKinley closed the case, police reports indicate.

During that time, neither Roemer nor his church superiors were contacted by deputies, several sheriff's administrators confirm.

McKinley defended his decision in the Roemer case, saying that it was "not prosecutable." The alleged crime occurred in May, he pointed out, seven months before

the boy's mother reported it Dec. 27.

In addition, McKinley said, the alleged molestation took place outside the jurisdiction of Ventura County, investigators had no evidence to corroborate the child's story, and the parents did not want to pursue criminal prosecution.

"I can't say that normally the suspect in a case like this would not be interviewed, but it was a judgment call at the time," McKinley said.

"If I don't have a case I can competently make an arrest on or legitimately investigate, I can't justify the manpower."

McKinley said he also never directly contacted Roemer's superior, the

(See ARREST, Page 3)

inside

California news.....Page 4
International news.....Page 19
National news.....Page 16
At your service.....Page 11

Comics.....Page 17
Classified.....Pages 20-23
Living.....Pages 9-10
Mini-pages.....Pages 7-6

Opinion.....Page 24
Sports.....Pages 13-15
Starscope.....Page 17
Weather.....Page 11

Arrest

From Page 1

Rev. Colm O'Ryan. He said the victim's mother told him she had spoken to O'Ryan and was satisfied that he was going to take some sort of action.

Undersheriff John Gillespie said in a News Chronicle interview that while it is not unusual that a suspect is not interviewed in such cases, it is unusual that superiors were not interviewed by law enforcement officers.

"Not to talk to a church official would probably be unusual," if there was "firm information" that a child molestation had occurred, Gillespie said.

Now, sheriff's observers are wondering if three young victims might have been spared if Roemer had at least been contacted by deputies.

Two days after the boy's parents called deputies on Dec. 27, McKinley contacted the Rev. Jack Christiansen at the Sacred Heart Catholic parish in Ventura for advice on how to handle the situation "administratively," police reports indicate.

McKinley has since refused to comment on what advice the priest gave him, however, saying the matter is still in litigation because Roemer has not yet been sentenced.

After talking with Christiansen, McKinley assigned Deputy Tom Odle to interview the youngster Jan. 2. The deputy determined in the police report that the child was "probably

truthful" about the incident.

The child's mother told Odle that she had spoken to the Rev. Colm O'Ryan, Roemer's superior at St. Paschal's. O'Ryan assured her that the situation would be handled by church officials, police documents state.

The investigation stopped there. As McKinley wrote in a police report dated Jan. 5:

"As the incident occurred more than seven months ago in another jurisdiction and a copy of the report had been sent to San Bernardino County sheriff's office for statistical purposes and the victim and parents desire no formal prosecution and they have brought the incident to the attention of the superior of (the) suspect, presumably competent authority, no further action is warranted by this department. Case closed."

Undersheriff John Gillespie explains the handling of the case this way: "If the superior of a church says this has to be an isolated case and we will handle it, then perhaps our detectives believed that. Every case is just a little bit different. . . I can't defend it (the decision not to prosecute), but I can't take it apart, either," Gillespie said.

Detectives routinely consider the character of the suspect in each case before deciding how to act upon a particular matter — whether the suspect be a priest, doctor, teacher or mechanic, he explained.

Gillespie said it is not uncommon for investigators to avoid interviewing a suspect, especially if the victim wishes no criminal prosecution. Other times, however, suspects are interviewed whether or not prosecution is desired. It is purely the discretion of the investigators, he said.

"If an 18-year-old kid is accused of molesting a 15-year-old girl, then we might talk to him and put the fear of God in him and it would probably keep an 18-year-old in line."

"If we're talking about a respected priest, then probably the most effective tool would be to contact his superior and let it go at that."

Gillespie stressed that he did not feel the investigator's personal religious beliefs influenced his decision to leave the matter in the hands of church officials without speaking with Roemer.

"We have looked at the possibility of conflict of interest," Gillespie said. "But you have to know the man. Lt. McKinley is probably as honest a police officer as any I've every met. He is a police officer — a major-crime detective, first — and a lay deacon in the church, second."

Church officials will not comment on what, if any, action was taken after the victim's mother made them aware of the situation in December. The only certain fact is that the molestations continued.

April 3, 1981

His Eminence Timothy Cardinal Manning
Chancery Office
1531 West 9th Street
Los Angeles, Ca.

Dear Cardinal Manning:

I am a responsible Catholic family father who has lived in the Thousand Oaks area for nearly 20 years. I presently attend St. Julies' Billiard church in Newbury Park. I have always held our priests and religious in the highest esteem.

The recent disclosures in the press and on television concerning Father Patrick Roemer of St. Paschal Baylon's of Thousand Oaks has prompted this letter. I have known Father Roemer casually for years, and have always thought highly of him.

I and the faithful have prayed that the molestation charges brought against him were not true. Unfortunately, it appears that they were. Enclosed is the latest of a series of articles that have dealt harshly with his situation. This problem can't be corrected since what is done-is done. But what will occur in the future is something we must all be concerned with.

The following is submitted for your kind consideration:

- a. The church should provide support and counseling for the children involved in these incidents. The parents of these children should also be counseled. Letters of apology should include these offers of help.
- b. Stringent procedures and disclosure requirements of any abnormal behavior patterns of Clergy and the religious should be established. Voluntary help by those in need should be stressed.
- c. Immediate substantial professional counseling should be mandated for those suffering problems. (This situation may have been avoided if advantage was taken of the Catholic psychiatrists in this area).
- d. Reassignment of religious to less sensitive jobs until permanent correction of any problem can be established.

These suggestions are meant to be constructive, and I am sure you feel as deeply hurt by this incident. We all pray that Father Roemer is not judged too harshly, and that future occurrences are eliminated.

Yours faithfully,
REDACTED

REDACTED

5857

Thursday P.M.

Dear Cardinal Manning,

I can do hope that all goes well for you and all you do!

I thought I'd just take a few moments to show what's been going on in my "situation".

Last week, I got all my "goodies" moved from the rectory to my parents' house in REDACTED

(18 boxes of books & some clothes!) I also completed 4 days of psychiatric evaluations from the court appointed doctors. I just was landed out-house. I trust in God that this is the way for me to be, despite personal complications and pains etc. The results are given in court on Friday, May 4th. Then, Judge Shaw could set the final sentence date, or give me a sentence there - my lawyer feels this will only come later in May. I go to Monterrey near S.F.

this Sunday and stay until
Wednesday at the Home of
Affirmation for their evaluation.
I sure hope and pray I can go
there as part of my therapy and
sentencing.

I've been "told" by one psychi-
atrist that I'll have to do 90
days at Atascadero Mental Hospital -
part of a new law. REDACTED
-REDACTED

REDACTED

I wanted you to know all the
"prosecutions" or at least what's
happening. Naturally, I'm a little
nervous & unsure about having to
go there, but if I have to, I
am open to that.

All in all, I guess I am
doing okay. As I stated before,

3

I am learning very strongly how
to take all experience (or wisdom)
a day at a time.

I am grateful for all your
listening and loyal support
and kindness to me.

I pray you enjoy a good
week!

Sincerely and Gratefully
in our River hand,

Pat Raine

5878

Good Friday p.m.

Dear Cardinal Manning,

This day was so great to and
for us! Thanks very much for all your
kind attention, concern, and very
much appreciated legal support.

I pray all the best Easter
Blessings upon you. May all go well
for you, very sincerely & gratefully, in the best -
Pat Hoover

5879

PTL Publications
398 PTL 224



*Behold the fowls of the air for they sow not neither
do they reap nor gather into barns yet your heavenly
Father feedeth them. Are you not much better than they?
Matt. 6: 26*

5880

Sunday

Dear Cardinal Manning,

I hope and pray all goes well for you!

Thought I'd share what's been happening, so you could get it from the "piously housed" mouth, first I had a very hard time in Court Tuesday - the D. A. argued strongly for 10 1/2 yrs state prison, and showed pictures of kids and read over many parts of my psychiatric evaluations etc - I felt like crawling underneath the Court carpet! But the judge gave me M.D.S.C. status & ordered me to 90 days at Atascadero state hospital. REDACTED argued about there being similar local facilities and the judge said we could study them & he'd consider them & finally decide when I must do my 90 days on May 29th I

Could get St James' Hosp. ignored as
St John's; Santa Monica because they
both have "leap" vested coats,
at least. I'd like them please
better than Atascadero

I had 3 days of very intense
testing at the House of Affirmation
early last week - I relaxed my
schedule; I was accepted as a
potential resident, & so I could be
sent there by the court after my
90 days. It's a big beautiful
place - 20 acres & plenty to do
there. I hope & pray I can go
there.

I hope you have a great
week. I feel I am doing okay -
some days, I am "all-nerves"; but
I really feel people's prayer at
work.

Sincerely & Gratefully,
Pat Palma

April 9, 1981

REDACTED

Dear REDACTED

His Eminence, Cardinal Manning, has asked that I respond to your letter of April 3, 1981.

Please be assured that your observations were well received.

With kindest best regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

Reverend Monsignor John A. Rawden
Chancellor

REDACTED

5856

St. Paschal Baylon Church

155 East Janas Road

Thousand Oaks, California 91360

April 10, 1981

Reverend Monsignor Benjamin G. Hawkes
1531 West NINTH Street
Los Angeles, Cal. 90015

Dear Monsignor Hawkes:

In a telephone conversation earlier this week you asked me to put some things in writing.

The first matter concerns the payment of salary to Fr Pat Roemer. I have been paying his salary while he's been on sick leave, and I will pay his salary for April. You said you would pick up the payments after that.

The second concerns the parish car Fr Pat has been driving. REDACTED has approved the appointment of the Rev. REDACTED as Associate here at St. Paschal's as of April 28 1981. On June 14, Fr REDACTED will go elsewhere, at which time I hope to have a replacement. At least, the Placement Board say I may expect this. It is for this reason that I requested Fr. Pat to attempt to find other transportation as of that date..

Allow me to thank you for your kindness to Pat. The guy needs all the support we can give him at this stage. And he deserves it, for there was scarcely a better priest than he.

Yours sincerely in Christ
REDACTED

Rev. REDACTED

Mrs. Hawkes
we noted on table file to pay
Fr Roemer an associate's salary
(presently \$250 a month) starting with
salary for May 1981 which we will
pay at end of this month. We will
give check to REDACTED REDACTED
for delivery
to Fr Roemer.
REDACTED

5/13/81

REDACTED

May 2, 1981

His Eminence Cardinal Timothy Manning
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

Dear Cardinal Manning:

I am the father of two children. We are parishioners of St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church in Thousand Oaks where my son attends CCD training. The REDACTED family are good friends of ours and came to me for help when their two boys were victimized by Father Patrick Roemer. I also worked with the REDACTED family whose son was also a victim.

Your Eminence, the purpose of this letter is to request a meeting with you within the next 10 days. If we can have some direct and open communication between us, perhaps we can work together to help the families and the victims of this terrible tragedy. To my personal knowledge, none of these families seek civil action against the church. Our mutual and sincere interest is to help prevent or minimize the chances of this tragedy from being repeated.

This terrible nightmare occurred and we cannot ignore it. Sex crimes against children have gone unreported too long and have left the children carrying the scars for a lifetime. These crimes occurred on church property or church sponsored activity and were committed by an employee and member of the church's staff. You must agree that the responsibility for the safety and protection of all our children is at stake and must be considered the most important priority.

We have been disturbed by the handling of this case:

1. Father Colm O'Ryan was informed of the activity of Father Roemer but due to his lack of understanding of the problem failed to take appropriate action.
2. The church immediately assigned REDACTED a civil attorney employed by the archdiocese, to defend these criminal actions,
 - a. This attorney attempted to intimidate the families by talking about having cameras in the courtroom and printing the names of the victims,

Cardinal Timothy Manning

-2-

May 2, 1981

- b. He compounded the hardships of the victims by handing out a list of names to other victims' families. This showed little ethics and concern for the families involved.
 - c. REDACTED called the REDACTED and demanded to talk to the children when legally he was not entitled to do so.
3. There was no cooperation between the archdiocese or Father O'Ryan and the law enforcement agencies investigating this case.
 4. Father O'Ryan called the victims and requested that they write a letter to keep Father Roemer from going to prison. His attitude seemed to be -- What can we do for Father Roemer, not -- What can we do for the children.
 5. Not once did the church (local or diocese) call any of the victims and offer spiritual support, family counseling, or monetary aid for psychological help needed for the children.

Where is the compassion for the innocent victims? Is there a total disregard for the plight of these children? Some of the families involved have left the church or moved to other parishes. Three of the children have become almost agnostic.

There was criminal sophistication in Father Roemer's actions. He used his talent working with these children and violated their trust and friendships. Father Roemer is a man who admits to having tremendous psychological, emotional and spiritual training. With his knowledge and background, he should have removed himself from the temptation of committing these sex offenses. The crimes did not happen by chance. Each time Father Roemer called a victim into the teacher's lounge, he showed intent and he used that opportunity to accost the child alone and get him in a compromising situation. A child is not capable of giving consent, and all responsibility for the acts committed lie with the abusing adult. We, therefore, question the value of placing Father Roemer in the House of Affirmation in San Francisco for therapy.

Your Eminence, it's normal to want to bury this incident, but that won't protect our children. We must learn to recognize and confront the problem of sexual child abuse. We must accept our burden of responsibility to initiate change and to adopt preventive measures to keep this from reoccurring.

5853

Cardinal Timothy Manning

-3-

May 2, 1981

We must bear in mind that the churches' utmost responsibility is for the safety and welfare of the children entrusted to it by its parishioners. That crimes against children have no equal and cannot be tolerated. Had it not been for the bad publicity and exposure, would Father Roemer been transferred to another location and continue to offend? As long as he is a member of the church, it is the churches' responsibility to see that anyone guilty of these crimes is not placed in a position which chances the repeat of these offenses.

The Catholic Church can use this tragedy to educate its staff on the subject. Guidelines should be given to all pastors on how to handle this sensitive problem. Seminaries and schools can be given specific instruction on the consequences of criminal actions committed by a clergy. A priest found guilty of inappropriate conduct cannot be shielded by his Roman collar from criminal prosecution. The nature of this crime demands immediate removal of the duties and activities that place the accused in contact with children.

I have enclosed a copy of the Statement of Facts in this case for your review. Also enclosed are:

1. A copy of Child Molestation: The Problem and a Proposed Solution written by the District Attorney of Ventura County
2. Articles written by Dr. Roland Summit and Carolyn Swift, both considered experts in the field of child molestation. These articles may shed some light as to the lifetime trauma the victims experience as a result of these crimes.

We urge your personal attention to the details of this case and hope to meet with you at your convenience soon.

Sincerely,

REDACTED

(home phone REDACTED)
 (message-secretary, REDACTED)
 Go REDACTED)

Enclosures

5854

REDACTED

May 2, 1981

His Eminence Cardinal Timothy Manning
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

Dear Cardinal Manning:

I am the father of two children. We are parishioners of St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church in Thousand Oaks where my son attends CCD training. The REDACTED family are good friends of ours and came to me for help when their two boys were victimized by Father Patrick Roemer. I also worked with the REDACTED family whose son was also a victim.

→ Your Eminence, the purpose of this letter is to request a meeting with you within the next 10 days. If we can have some direct and open communication between us, perhaps we can work together to help the families and the victims of this terrible tragedy. To my personal knowledge, none of these families seek civil action against the church. Our mutual and sincere interest is to help prevent or minimize the chances of this tragedy from being repeated.

This terrible nightmare occurred and we cannot ignore it. Sex crimes against children have gone unreported too long and have left the children carrying the scars for a lifetime. These crimes occurred on church property or church sponsored activity and were committed by an employee and member of the church's staff. You must agree that the responsibility for the safety and protection of all our children is at stake and must be considered the most important priority.

We have been disturbed by the handling of this case:

1. Father Colm O'Ryan was informed of the activity of Father Roemer but due to his lack of understanding of the problem failed to take appropriate action.
2. The church immediately assigned REDACTED a civil attorney employed by the archdiocese. to defend these criminal actions, *via REDACTED is a Criminal Attorney and represents Fr. Roemer*
 - a. This attorney attempted to intimidate the families by talking about having cameras in the courtroom and printing the names of the victims,

Cardinal Timothy Manning

-2-

May 2, 1981

- b. He compounded the hardships of the victims by handing out a list of names to other victims' families. This showed little ethics and concern for the families involved.
- c. REDACTED called the REDACTED and demanded to talk to the children when legally he was not entitled to do so.

- 3. There was no cooperation between the archdiocese or Father O'Ryan and the law enforcement agencies investigating this case.
- 4. Father O'Ryan called the victims and requested that they write a letter to keep Father Roemer from going to prison. His attitude seemed to be -- What can we do for Father Roemer, not -- What can we do for the children.
- 5. Not once did the church (local or diocese) call any of the victims and offer spiritual support, family counseling, or monitary aid for psychological help needed for the children.

Where is the compassion for the innocent victims? Is there a total disregard for the plight of these children? Some of the families involved have left the church or moved to other parishes. Three of the children have become almost agnostic.

There was criminal sophistication in Father Roemer's actions. He used his talent working with these children and violated their trust and friendships. Father Roemer is a man who admits to having tremendous psychological, emotional and spiritual training. With his knowledge and background, he should have removed himself from the temptation of committing these sex offenses. The crimes did not happen by chance. Each time Father Roemer called a victim into the teacher's lounge, he showed intent and he used that opportunity to accost the child alone and get him in a compromising situation. A child is not capable of giving consent, and all responsibility for the acts committed lie with the abusing adult. We, therefore, question the value of placing Father Roemer in the House of Affirmation in San Francisco for therapy.

Your Eminence, it's normal to want to bury this incident, but that won't protect our children. We must learn to recognize and confront the problem of sexual child abuse. We must accept our burden of responsibility to initiate change and to adopt preventive measures to keep this from reoccurring.

5850

Cardinal Timothy Manning

-3-

May 2, 1981

We must bear in mind that the churches' utmost responsibility is for the safety and welfare of the children entrusted to it by its parishioners. That crimes against children have no equal and cannot be tolerated. Had it not been for the bad publicity and exposure, would Father Roemer been transferred to another location and continue to offend? As long as he is a member of the church, it is the churches' responsibility to see that anyone guilty of these crimes is not placed in a position which chances the repeat of these offenses.

xx → The Catholic Church can use this tragedy to educate its staff on the subject. Guidelines should be given to all pastors on how to handle this sensitive problem. Seminaries and schools can be given specific instruction on the consequences of criminal actions committed by a clergy. A priest found guilty of inappropriate conduct cannot be shielded by his Roman collar from criminal prosecution. The nature of this crime demands immediate removal of the duties and activities that place the accused in contact with children.

I have enclosed a copy of the Statement of Facts in this case for your review. Also enclosed are:

1. A copy of Child Molestation: The Problem and a Proposed Solution written by the District Attorney of Ventura County
2. Articles written by Dr. Roland Summit and Carolyn Swift, both considered experts in the field of child molestation. These articles may shed some light as to the lifetime trauma the victims experience as a result of these crimes.

We urge your personal attention to the details of this case and hope to meet with you at your convenience soon.

Sincerely,

REDACTED

REDACTED

(home phone REDACTED

(message-secretary, REDACTED

REDACTED

Enclosures

5851

REDACTED

May 2, 1981

His Eminence Cardinal Timothy Manning
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

Dear Cardinal Manning:

I am the father of two children. We are parishioners of St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church in Thousand Oaks where my son attends CCD training. The REDACTED family are good friends of ours and came to me for help when their two boys were victimized by Father Patrick Roemer. I also worked with the REDACTED family whose son was also a victim.

Your Eminence, the purpose of this letter is to request a meeting with you within the next 10 days. If we can have some direct and open communication between us, perhaps we can work together to help the families and the victims of this terrible tragedy. To my personal knowledge, none of these families seek civil action against the church. Our mutual and sincere interest is to help prevent or minimize the chances of this tragedy from being repeated.

This terrible nightmare occurred and we cannot ignore it. Sex crimes against children have gone unreported too long and have left the children carrying the scars for a lifetime. These crimes occurred on church property or church sponsored activity and were committed by an employee and member of the church's staff. You must agree that the responsibility for the safety and protection of all our children is at stake and must be considered the most important priority.

We have been disturbed by the handling of this case:

1. Father Colm O'Ryan was informed of the activity of Father Roemer but due to his lack of understanding of the problem failed to take appropriate action.
2. The church immediately assigned REDACTED a civil attorney employed by the archdiocese, to defend these criminal actions,
 - a. This attorney attempted to intimidate the families by talking about having cameras in the courtroom and printing the names of the victims,

Cardinal Timothy Manning

-2-

May 2, 1981

- b. He compounded the hardships of the victims by handing out a list of names to other victims' families. This showed little ethics and concern for the families involved.
 - c. Mr. REDACTED called the REDACTED and demanded to talk to the children when legally he was not entitled to do so.
3. There was no cooperation between the archdiocese or Father O'Ryan and the law enforcement agencies investigating this case.
 4. Father O'Ryan called the victims and requested that they write a letter to keep Father Roemer from going to prison. His attitude seemed to be -- What can we do for Father Roemer, not -- What can we do for the children.
 5. Not once did the church (local or diocese) call any of the victims and offer spiritual support, family counseling, or monetary aid for psychological help needed for the children.

Where is the compassion for the innocent victims? Is there a total disregard for the plight of these children? Some of the families involved have left the church or moved to other parishes. Three of the children have become almost agnostic.

There was criminal sophistication in Father Roemer's actions. He used his talent working with these children and violated their trust and friendships. Father Roemer is a man who admits to having tremendous psychological, emotional and spiritual training. With his knowledge and background, he should have removed himself from the temptation of committing these sex offenses. The crimes did not happen by chance. Each time Father Roemer called a victim into the teacher's lounge, he showed intent and he used that opportunity to accost the child alone and get him in a compromising situation. A child is not capable of giving consent, and all responsibility for the acts committed lie with the abusing adult. We, therefore, question the value of placing Father Roemer in the House of Affirmation in San Francisco for therapy.

Your Eminence, it's normal to want to bury this incident, but that won't protect our children. We must learn to recognize and confront the problem of sexual child abuse. We must accept our burden of responsibility to initiate change and to adopt preventive measures to keep this from reoccurring.

5847

Cardinal Timothy Manning

-3-

May 2, 1981

We must bear in mind that the churches' utmost responsibility is for the safety and welfare of the children entrusted to it by its parishioners. That crimes against children have no equal and cannot be tolerated. Had it not been for the bad publicity and exposure, would Father Roemer been transferred to another location and continue to offend? As long as he is a member of the church, it is the churches' responsibility to see that anyone guilty of these crimes is not placed in a position which chances the repeat of these offenses.

The Catholic Church can use this tragedy to educate its staff on the subject. Guidelines should be given to all pastors on how to handle this sensitive problem. Seminaries and schools can be given specific instruction on the consequences of criminal actions committed by a clergy. A priest found guilty of inappropriate conduct cannot be shielded by his Roman collar from criminal prosecution. The nature of this crime demands immediate removal of the duties and activities that place the accused in contact with children.

I have enclosed a copy of the Statement of Facts in this case for your review. Also enclosed are:

1. A copy of Child Molestation: The Problem and a Proposed Solution written by the District Attorney of Ventura County
2. Articles written by Dr. Roland Summit and Carolyn Swift, both considered experts in the field of child molestation. These articles may shed some light as to the lifetime trauma the victims experience as a result of these crimes.

We urge your personal attention to the details of this case and hope to meet with you at your convenience soon.

Sincerely,

REDACTED
 (home phone REDACTED
 (message-secretary, REDACTED
 REDACTED .)

Enclosures

5848

WELCOME TO: REVEREND PATRICK ROMER

SCHEDULE FOR SUNDAY, MAY 3 THROUGH WEDNESDAY, MAY 6, 1981

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

I almost forgot - all my bank checks are sent to you and my judge, & lawyer. They needed to know who my "employer" was & I asked if they'd send copies of my "checks" to you. I hope so. Pat K.

HOUSE OF AFFIRMATION, INC.

International Therapeutic Center for Clergy and Religious

REDACTED

PERTINENT INFORMATION AND DONATION SCHEDULE

5.

The House of Affirmation presents a total psychotheological program in which all psychotherapists are competent in the psychological sciences and have a deep understanding of the religious and priestly life.

Our Whitinsville residential center is approximately forty miles from Boston and twenty-eight miles from Providence, Rhode Island. Our California residential center is at Montara, California, which is located about fifteen miles south of San Francisco on the ocean side of the peninsula. Our Missouri residential center is located at Webster Groves, an immediate suburb of St. Louis.

DONATION SCHEDULE

The following information pertains to our donation schedule and residential program. The requested donation of \$87.00 per diem reflects the following services rendered: private room and board, ancillary therapies, nursing services, bibliotherapy, psychotheology and spirituality programs; individual psychotherapy sessions usually held twice a week; group psychotherapy sessions held four times a week in the form of Psychodrama, Inter-Communication Lab, and Group Therapy; and Group Art Therapy Sessions.

In addition there is, on occasion, a requested donation of \$35.00 for each psychiatric consultation, \$25.00 for each medical consultation, and \$10.00 per week for art therapy supplies. Outside medical referrals, laboratory services and pharmacy charges are additional.

Billing is entered at a flat rate of \$87.00 per diem.

5842

456 Hill Street • Whitinsville, Massachusetts 01588 • REDACTED

Please note that we are not a hospital but a Residential Center for religious professionals. We do not submit claims to Blue Cross or to any other insurance company. However, it has been our experience to have some communities/dioceses obtain a partial refund of the money paid House of Affirmation. Should your particular contract allow for reimbursement of payments made, we will assist you in completing your forms.

The donations requested are approximately one-half to two-thirds below the current marketable set rate for similar services. We at the House of Affirmation believe that we cannot charge the usual professional fee because the priests and Religious we serve do not have the same kind of financial income that other people have.

It continues to be our policy not to refuse assistance to anyone who is unable to meet our requested donations. Requests for assistance should be submitted accordingly. However, it must be noted that our scholarship funds are limited.

PSYCHOTHEOLOGICAL EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

The client comes to the House of Affirmation for three days during which time he or she undergoes complete psychological testing and interviews. This program does allow for a more personal and complete evaluation of the client's problematic and also offers the client an opportunity to meet the Clinical Staff and personally assess the program offered here. A complete report along with the recommendations of the Clinical Staff is then forwarded to the assigned ecclesial leader as authorized by the client. Should the Clinical Staff be of the opinion that the client would indeed benefit from a period of residency at the House of Affirmation, the client is then given priority on our waiting list. The donation for the Psychotheological Evaluation and Assessment Program (including room and board) is \$500.00, and arrangements for same may be made with our nurse, Mrs. REDACTED
REDACTED

Chauffeur services available at a minimum cost.

MEMORANDUM

TO: REDACTED

FROM:

RE: FATHER DONALD P. ROEMER

DATE: 7 MAY 1981

REDACTED

On May 5th Bishop Moreno asked that I speak to Dr. REDACTED regarding Father Pat Roemer. Dr. REDACTED informed me that more than likely Father Roemer would have to undergo a ninth day Psychiatric Evaluation in an institution. He asked if I could possibly find a Catholic Psychiatric Hospital ? Otherwise the state might commit him to Atascadero.

Through the assistance of the Sisters of St. Vincent I was put in touch with a Dr. REDACTED at DePaul Community Health Center, St. Vincent's Division, 12303 DePaul Drive, Bridgton, Mo. 63044.

Dr. REDACTED said that they would be happy to take Father Roemer for the 90 days and could place him in a congenial atmosphere.

Dr. REDACTED is also licenced to practice in California.

REDACTED

REDACTED

5841

MEMORANDUM

TO: CARDINAL MANNING
FROM: MONSIGNOR RAWDEN
RE: FATHER DONALD P. ROEMER
DATE: 7 MAY 1981

Your Eminence:

On May 5th I REDACTED asked that I speak to Dr. REDACTED ,
regarding Father Pat Roemer. Dr. REDACTED informed me that more than likely
Father Roemer would have to undergo a ninety day Psychiatric Evaluation in
an institution. He asked if I could possibly find a Catholic Psychiatric
Hospital ? Otherwise the state might commit him to Atascadero.

Through the assistance of the Sisters of St. Vincent I was put in touch
with a Dr. REDACTED at DePaul Community
Health Center, St. Vincent's Division, 12303 DePaul Drive, Bridgton, Mo.
63044.

Dr. REDACTED said that they would be happy to take Father Roemer for the 90
days and could place him in a congenial atmosphere.

Dr. REDACTED is also licenced to practice in California.
Dr. REDACTED has been made aware of the above.

HOUSE OF AFFIRMATION, INC.

International Therapeutic Center for Clergy and Religious

8 May 1981

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION

REDACTED

His Eminence Timothy Cardinal Manning, D.D., J.C.D.
1531 W. 9th Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

RE: Reverend Donald Patrick Roemer

Your Eminence:

456 Hill Street
Whitinsville, Massachusetts 01588
617/234-6266

REGIONAL DIRECTORS

REDACTED

This letter is to inform you that Reverend Donald Patrick Roemer participated in our three day psychotheological assessment program May 3 to May 6, 1981. These results have been communicated to him by me personally. A clinical report will follow shortly. Father Roemer will receive copies of these letters.

REDACTED

At this point we would normally put him on a waiting list for residency which could take anywhere from three to six months before we would have an opening. However, due to the nature of his legal problems we are offering an immediate opening when and if the courts will allow him to come to us.

I am enclosing some information concerning our program, its cost, etc. which will be helpful to you. We do require a written statement from you informing us that you are supportive of the client's decision and are willing to assume full responsibility for all expenses incurred throughout the client's stay at the House of Affirmation. Please send that statement to our Central Administration in Massachusetts to REDACTED
REDACTED 120 Hill Street, Whitinsville, Massachusetts 01588.

5838

1185 Acacia Street • Box 437 • Montara, California 94037 • 415/728-3361

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

His Eminence Timothy Cardinal Manning, D.D., J.C.D.
8 May 1981
Page 2

RE: Reverend Donald Patrick Roemer

Please do not hesitate to contact our Central Administration should you desire further information. Meanwhile please keep us in your prayers as you are in ours.

In The Lord's Care, REDACTED
REDACTED

REDACTED

cc: Reverend Donald Patrick Roemer
Enclosure

5839

Priest seen as mentally disordered

Earlier molest complaint was filed against priest

By FAYE FIORE

By GAIL GROSS

Daily News Staff Writer

The Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer, who admitted to molesting young boys at his Thousand Oaks parish, Friday was declared a mentally disordered sex offender needing confinement in a mental hospital.

Judge Robert L. Shaw of Ventura County Superior Court said he "probably would be inclined" to commit the Catholic priest to Atascadero State Hospital, but he indicated he would consider sending Roemer to a private facility.

Roemer, 37, pleaded no contest — treated the same way as a guilty plea in criminal proceedings — to three of eight felony counts involving the molestation of boys aged 7, 10 and 10. They were all members of St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church in Thousand Oaks, where Roemer headed the youth program.

The prosecution agreed to drop the remaining counts at the time of sentencing.

Deputy District Attorney Joseph E. Taylor asked the judge to find Roemer a mentally disordered sex offender, but he urged a jail sentence for the priest, citing what he labeled the enormity of his crimes and the ineffectiveness of available treatment.

Shaw said he would name the hospital May 29 in order to give Dr. William C. Keating Jr., county mental health director, more time to explore alternatives to Atascadero.

Keating recommended sending Roemer to the De Paul Mental Health Complex in Bridgeton, Mo. Recommended by the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, the facility is experienced in dealing with troubled priests, he said.

Shaw agreed with three court-appointed psychiatrists that Roemer would benefit from treatment. He also concurred with two of those doctors, as well as attorneys for both prosecution and defense, that the priest is mentally disordered and poses a danger to society.

Dr. Donald Patterson of Santa Barbara gave the court a favorable prognosis for Roemer's cure in his written evaluation.

Shaw agreed with Patterson that Roemer is a mentally disordered sex offender, adding, "He is amenable to care and treatment if anyone is. He has never used force or violence on any of his victims."

Roemer faces a maximum confinement of 10½ years.

Taylor said the priest molested at least 16 young parishioners between last May and January 1981. Roemer confessed to the crimes.

But Taylor, in arguing for reinstitution of criminal proceedings, said Roemer had used his position of trust for his own sexual gratification for 11 years before being caught.

The law allowing sex offenders to be classified as mentally disordered and sent to hospitals instead of prison is "an approach that has failed," Taylor said, quoting from an American Psychiatric Association statistical manual.

The district attorney contends men who are sexually attracted to young boys cannot be treated successfully in the structured program at Atascadero and other state mental hospitals.

Defense attorney Bruce Mayfield argued that Roemer is a sick man who needs psychiatric help, not prison. Incarceration would be "psychologically lethal and physically devastating" to the priest, whom he described as "a genuinely gentle and kind man who succumbed to a weakness he could not control."

Mayfield reminded the judge of the three dozen letters sent to the court by Roemer's supporters, many from the parish.

She was up until 1 a.m. today, concerned about the tone of the letters in the newspaper.

She's read the comments from faithful supporters who cannot fathom the idea that Father Donald Patrick Roemer was arrested for charges of child molesting.

But she views the case from a different perspective. Her son, she says, was also molested by the 36-year-old St. Paschal Baylon priest.

The young Newbury Park woman contacted the News Chronicle late this morning to say that her family filed a complaint with the Ventura County Sheriff's Department last December after their son, then 8 years old, was allegedly sexually molested by Roemer.

Authorities confirmed today that such a complaint was filed with them in December.

What most disturbs the young woman, who insisted she not be identified, is that the clergyman's supporters have blindly refused to accept the possibility that a man she says she, too, respects is less than perfect.

"The input I wanted to give," she said in a slow, even voice, "is that this is a man I can't even be angry with. I see him as being very sick and in need of help, but he also gives so much help."

"He has done so much good, and one bad thing doesn't cancel all of that."

Supporters who insist upon Roemer's innocence in fervent letters to the News Chronicle are placing an unfair burden upon his shoulders by refusing to accept that he is capable of a human flaw, the woman said. The community response so disturbed her, she said, that she decided to call the newspaper.

"People who are writing these letters are making it sound like he has to be innocent because if he isn't, he's no good," she said. "He knows they have a false confidence in him to be perfect and they are not giving him any slack at all."

This morning, Roemer pleaded not guilty to a child molesting charge during an

arraignment in Ventura Municipal Court.

The newspaper and sheriff's department have both been the target of criticism by local parishioners with unwaivering confidence in his innocence. They have chastised the media for publishing the report of his arrest.

The woman said she and her husband contacted the Child Abuse, Neglect and Protection Clinic in Ventura after the incident, the details of which she was careful not to discuss to avoid jeopardizing the court case.

The clinic reportedly told her that a child of 6 or 7 years of age does not have the creative capacity to invent the detailed sexual encounter described.

Vocal critics have alleged that the child manufactured the story and that many of the men involved in the church are now apprehensive about working with children.

"I know the charges are true," she said. "I don't know if there is a third or a fourth victim, but I know that, other than my husband, there is no man whom I would hate more to hear this about."

Since the incident, the mother said, her child's grades have fallen in school and he is unable to concentrate.

On his last report card before the incident, the youth received the equivalent of 22 out of 26 A's. This time, she says, his teacher called to warn her that he is receiving mostly C's and D's and is having particular problems in behavior.

The family is not a member of St. Paschal's parish and the alleged encounter occurred in a setting outside of the parish, she explained. When their child described the incident to them, the woman said they sought advice from St. Paschal's co-administrator, Father Colm O'Ryan.

Church officials, she was told, were instructed to speak with Roemer about the problem.

In response to bitter complaints that the sheriff's department hastily arrested the clergyman on the "word of a 7-year-old," the woman pointed out that the investigation was already proceeding last December.

"The district attorney's approach ignores the man," Mayfield said. "Admittedly, they are bad acts; they are tragic acts, but you cannot ignore the man here..."

"His sickness is indeed very sad, but I think if we incarcerate him without treatment, this society and this community will lose one of its valuable resources," he added.

Taylor recounted several of the molestations and the devastating effect on some of the boys, several of whom are still receiving psychological counseling. He interrupted his presentation to hand Shaw pictures of the victims.

"How could any person occupy a higher position of trust?" Taylor asked. "He dealt with the lives, souls and the minds of these children."



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
 1531 WEST NINTH STREET
 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015
 388-8101

May Eleventh
 1981

REDACTED

Central Administration
 House of Affirmation, Inc.
 REDACTED

Dear REDACTED

I am in receipt of a letter from Father
 REDACTED, House of Affirmation in Montara, California,
 concerning Father Donald Patrick Roemer. At his request this
 letter is being addressed to you.

This is to advise you that should the Judge
 assign Father Roemer to the House of Affirmation the diocese will
 assume full responsibility for all expenses incurred by him during
 his stay. We are in full accord with such action and feel it will
 be of benefit to him.

Very sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Timothy Cardinal Manning".

Timothy Cardinal Manning
 Archbishop of Los Angeles

cc: Reverend REDACTED
 REDACTED
 Montara, California 94037

B

5837

May Eleventh
1981

REDACTED

Central Administration
House of Affirmation, Inc.
REDACTED

Dear REDACTED

I am in receipt of a letter from Father
REDACTED, House of Affirmation in Montara, California,
concerning Father Donald Patrick Roemer. At his request this
letter is being addressed to you.

This is to advise you that should the Judge
assign Father Roemer to the House of Affirmation the diocese will
assume full responsibility for all expenses incurred by him during
his stay. We are in full accord with such action and feel it will
be of benefit to him.

Very sincerely yours,

Timothy Cardinal Manning
Archbishop of Los Angeles

cc: Reverend REDACTED
REDACTED

Montara, California 94037

B

5836

May 14th, 1981

Reverend Patrick Roemer
St. Mary's Seminary
1964 Las Canoas Road
Santa Barbara, Ca. 93105

Dear Pat:

Thank you for your recent note. I am glad
to be brought up to date.

I have also been in touch with Mr. REDACTED
and Mr. REDACTED

We will keep on hoping for the best and want
to assure you of our constant prayers.

With every best wish, I am

Very sincerely yours,

C

Timothy Cardinal Manning
Archbishop of Los Angeles

5835

CCI 002772

MEMORANDUM

TO: CARDINAL MANNING
FROM: BISHOP MORENO
DATE: 26 MAY 1981

Having met with the priests of Ventura at their Area Senate meeting, they expressed two concerns to me as Vicar. One, was Father REDACTED. He has informed them of his plans. They are worried about him, offering no comment about the possible Moorpark parish, except hoping that something can be done to help him in his vocation. I responded that we were well aware of the situation - that we were doing our best, and that I would convey their concerns to you. Since I am informed about this, you do not need to respond to this.

✓ Their other concern is about the families that were hurt in the Pat Roemer case. They were asking if anything can be done to help them. Again, my response was that I would bring this concern to you. Perhaps Monsignor Rawden can inform as to the best way to proceed.

REDACTED

May 27, 1981

C O P Y

Cardinal Timothy Manning
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 W. Ninth Street
Los Angeles CA. 90015

Dear Cardinal Manning;

Christ is Risen! Indeed He is Risen! I am writing to you out of fraternal concern for a priest of your archdiocese, Patrick R., whose difficult situation was reported earlier this month in the papers of San Francisco and was recently talked about at a gathering of priests and brothers here in The City. Upon first reading about the problems facing this priest I was overcome with a great sadness and compassion for him. I do not know the man personally, but my heart goes out to him. After reflecting on the deep and loving concern that was expressed by those who were talking about the situation at a social gathering, I felt compelled to write to you to ask that you convey to him my personal pledge of prayer for him and also convey the compassion of others for him. Over the past few years I have been privileged to find myself in situations where I have been able to assist persons struggling with various issues of sexual variations, among whom have been some priests and brothers. More than ever before the words of Jesus on whom to fear, "the one who can kill the soul", have come home to me very clearly. The evil of self rejection and self hatred is very present to persons going through a sexual crisis. It is at this time in such person's lives that the Gospel of God's unconditioned love and acceptance of each of us must be proclaimed to them gently but firmly. In this area I wish to commend you for your reported compassionate support of the priest in question. Thank you for being a good shepherd and father to the church of Los Angeles.

It is at times such as this that the true nature of love becomes manifest. It is so easy to love persons when they are "squeaky clean" but not so easy to embrace them when they are "messy". And yet this is what Jesus has done to us, even to the point of embracing the ugliness and messiness of our world and nailing to the cross with Himself. He became despised and rejected so that we no longer will despise and reject ourselves or each other.

I leave it to your best judgement on how best to convey my sentiments to Patrick R. It is because of this that I have written to you personally and confidentially. Be assured of my continued prayers for you and for him.

Fraternally in Christ,

REDACTED

Br. REDACTED

5825

MEMORANDUM

TO: CARDINAL MANNING
FROM: MONSIGNOR RAWDEN
DATE: 29 MAY 1981

Your Eminence:

I have made it my policy never to act in an ecclesiastical manner in a case that is still pending in a Civil Court. I feel that this might jeopardize the defendant.

I feel that two or three priests in the area might visit these families after a moratorium of perhaps six months.

cc: Bishop Moreno

5804

June 1. 81

Dear Ted,

God has his own ways
and we bend to his will.
He will bring good from
it all. Know that you
are close to our prayers
and hearts. In due time
I will try to visit with
you. The enclosed was
sent to me. I don't
know the man. Keep us
your heart. Sincerely

J. C. Manning

REDACTED

PERSONAL AND
CONFIDENTIAL

CARDINAL TIMOTHY MANNING
ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES
1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES CA. 90015

5828

Brother REDACTED
REDACTED

June 1, 81

Dear Father REDACTED,

Thanks for your supportive
letter. I have passed it on
to Owen Jones. He has a
difficult time dead but is
cushioned by priestly support
of all who love him.
J. C. Manning

opinion

Dealing with it

Roemer case is over, but results aren't

Not to deal with the case of Fr. Patrick Roemer would be easier for this newspaper than dealing with it. It would have been easier, too, for the courts not to deal with it, or for the church and its parishioners. It would have been easier for us all to avoid the topic.

But it will not go away; the sense of obligatory need to complete the record overwhelms the temptation to "render unto Caesar" and let it go at that.

The law has spoken in the case of the near-perfect priest who is a confessed homosexual pedophile. It is difficult to conceive a more awful fate than his: to be treated not as a priest but as a routine sexual psychopath. In effect, what the court said was that Roemer's priesthood is second to his criminality; that is a weighty judgment to make, and it speaks to the very center of the issue in the case.

It was in his work as a youth priest that Roemer found his vocation, offering the depth of faith and affectionate concern for young people, many of whom had lost both. That the reaching-out came from a man of the church made it all the more important to a segment of our population that too often is "turned off" by religion and its practitioners.

But it was also in that work that Roemer found a path toward fulfillment of those desires that ran absolutely counter to his priestly oath.

Those acts also carried with them the added weight of a religious source and may have driven off the victims as surely as others had their faith affirmed.

Fr. Roemer's fall from grace was a matter for religious interpretation, and one which the court of law could not chart or document. That is an ecclesiastical concern that will presumably be addressed by church authorities; if they had actual knowledge of it early-on, as indicated in probation investigation reports, they must look to their conscience to see why they did not act on it in a more timely manner. We are not privy to the church's methods in handling such situations after they are revealed, but must assume some disciplinary proceedings will follow for those who had a supervisory responsibility in this case.

But Fr. Roemer's inflicting of frightening, immoral and illegal acts on children was a matter for civil proceedings from the first, and should have been addressed before the list of his victims grew to two. In this case, it was not done, and it could have been. Why it wasn't is a question for explanation to higher civil authorities. The state attorney general's office ought to look into the way the county sheriff's office handles molestation complaints from parents of children, to assure that they are listened to and acted on before more damage occurs.

St. Paschal Baylon Church

155 E. JANSS ROAD
THOUSAND OAKS, CALIF. 91360
(805) 495-5177

June 2, 1981

Dear Clem:

I tried to call you on telephone last Friday, and you called back later when I was out of the house.

Pat Roemer will be taken to Atascadero state hospital to-morrow, Wednesday. Since Friday he has been in virtual isolation at the honor farm in Ojai.

Reports from and of the state hospital in Atascadero could hardly be worse. I truly fear for Pat's welfare. Far from any possibility of rehabilitation, I fear he will be ruined there. The decision to send him there was, in the opinion of many, including jurists, political.

To add insult to injury, the local newspaper has an editorial on the topic tonight - which I'm enclosing for you to read and to share with His Eminence. It is inflammatory, I believe. I have appealed time and again to our people NOT to respond to needling from same paper; and they have responded with magnanimous discipline. Now, the editor, not wanting to let the dust rest on this case, calls for the disciplining of those who exercised "supervisory" control. This is a direct attack on me. It also calls for an investigation of the Sheriff's office for their alleged failure to follow up on an earlier complaint.

Our parishioners will be very angry over this latest attack. Only God knows what sufferings we have endured in the past 4 months. Now this! I fear the people will no longer be able to restrain themselves. And, I suppose, this is what the media people would love: more publicity, more controversy, more incitement of passions.

Meanwhile, Pat goes to rot in a place where he does not belong. God help us all.

Sincerely -

REDACTED

5802

June 2, 1981

Reverend Bernard J. Bush
House of Affirmation
1185 Acacia Street
Box 437, Montara, Calif. 94037

Dear Father Bush:

His Eminence, Cardinal Manning, has asked that I
respond with his gratitude to your recent letter in reference
to Father PATRICK ROEMER.

With kindest best regards, I remain
Sincerely yours in Christ,

Reverend Monsignor John A. Rawden
Chancellor

REDACTED

5801

CCI 002782

No answers on priest

*was Chronical
March '81*

Church officials mum on allowing cleric to work with youths

By FAYE FIORE

Local Catholic Church leaders are refusing to comment on why a Conejo priest was made youth minister at his Thousand Oaks parish while he was undergoing counseling for his homosexual attraction to children.

The silence by administrators at St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church and the Catholic Archdiocese of Los Angeles is both frustrating and disquieting to a young Thousand Oaks couple whose two children were molested by the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer.

The story of the popular priest, who admits molesting boys who attended the church for Bible instruction, is just beginning to unfold even for the victims.

Now, they are looking with amazement at evidence which states the 36-year-old priest was fighting a homosexual attraction to children and receiving psychological counseling from another clergyman at the San Roque Catholic Church in Santa Barbara, where he was assigned before coming to St. Paschal's three years ago.

Evidence shows that Roemer was receiving counseling up until "four or five months ago," well into the time he was actively working with children attending Bible study classes at St. Paschal's and taking some on weekend retreats.

The information means that Roemer was seeking psychological care at the time he received the 1980 Honorary Service Award from the PTA for his work with Conejo youth.

An obviously pained Roemer indicated in a confession he made to East Valley sheriff's deputies hours after his arrest that he had been "fighting and fighting" his attraction to young boys.

Placing such a troubled man in a setting with children is much like locking an alcoholic in a liquor store and saying, "Don't drink," the parents of two of the victims agree.

Contacted this morning at St. Paschal's, the Rev. Colm O'Ryan was asked by the News Chronicle why Roemer was assigned as youth minister where parishioners say he rarely associated with adults. "I have no comment," was his only reply.

The pastor also refused to be interviewed by deputies during the investigation, records reveal.

The Rev. Clement Connolly, secretary to Cardinal Timothy Manning at the archdiocese, also refused to comment, saying it would violate the "confidentiality" of Roemer's counseling.

"This is obviously a very delicate matter and the confidentiality of his counseling is highly delicate," he said.

Connolly would not say whether Roemer's private attorney, Bruce Mayfield, is being paid out of church funds or by the priest.

In addition, he would release no information about what Roemer's future in the priesthood might be now that he must register as a sex offender. Roemer currently is not assigned to any parish and is "in private," Connolly said.

Tuesday night, the Millers (not the family's real name) sat in their living room reflecting on the turmoil of the recent weeks since their 7-year-old son told them Roemer molested him.

"We are angry and a little bitter," the boy's father said upon hearing prosecutors' evidence that church officials had several chances to remedy the problem, and let each go by.

As early as Dec. 27, a Newbury Park woman avoided pressing charges against the priest after he allegedly molested her 6-year-old son.

Interested only in seeing that the well-loved Roemer received help, the woman called St. Paschal's acting pastor O'Ryan on Dec. 27 and Jan. 30.

According to the woman's statements to investigators, O'Ryan promised her that the problem would be "thoroughly handled," offering this analogy: "It's like having a splinter in your thumb; if something isn't done about it, it continues to get worse."

In the next four weeks, three more children were molested by the priest — the three counts to which he essentially pleaded guilty in court.

Two of those three counts involved the Millers' sons.

The family has considered leaving the parish, feeling slighted by church leaders and some of its members.

"If a church isn't going to back its people, then what is a church?" the mother said.

Their report to deputies provided an inlet that led to a wave of similar complaints, all from children and families who knew of the priest's actions but did not come forward, often out of guilt or fear.

After the arrest, the parents were preoccupied with what the effects of the incident might be — whether their sons would be psychologically harmed by the encounters, if the children would feel guilty because "Father Pat" had to leave the parish or if they would blame their parents for calling deputies.

All of that, they now realize with anger,

could have been avoided if the situation was better handled by church officials. "I think they acted poorly," the father said.

O'Ryan called the family only once after the incidents, the couple said, and that was to request that they not speak with the press.

Although the couple was informed that some members of the church were praying both for Roemer and the children, they said the small amount of support was not enough to offset the bitter response from community members who accused them of having too little faith in their parish to keep the matter within the church and out of the hands of deputies.

The Millers feel that church leaders and some parishioners were more concerned about protecting Roemer than about the welfare of the children.

"At first, I felt sorry for Father Roemer," the mother said. "But it kept going on longer with no support for the victims — all of it went to the suspect."

The woman said that five days after Roemer was arrested, she took her son to church to make his first confession, a Catholic ceremony that children practice weeks for.

"Father Roemer wasn't there and I just broke down," she said. "I felt guilty and (her son) was disappointed because he had rehearsed with Father Pat."

The letters published on the News Chronicle editorial page did not ease the disquietude. The Millers said they even saw a critical letter from a friend who was unaware that she knew the family.

She said the faultfinding parishioners spoke without knowing the difficulty of trying to prepare their children to testify, before Roemer's no contest plea saved them from taking the stand. They were unaware that she dreaded that the boys would have to face Roemer, whom they, too, loved, and point him out in court as a child molester.

Tuesday was the couple's first opportunity to voice the anger they withheld for weeks as they read the letters that chastised them and called for publication of the name of their son — knowing the priest had already confessed.

"I am so angry that people would think my 7-year-old is a liar," the mother said. "They were upset that we went to the police because Father Pat 'showed a little too much affection.'"

"They didn't understand that besides our children being victims of a child molest and what all of this did to our family, that we, too, lost Father Pat."

Atascadero attempts to cure sex offenders

Attention was focused recently on child molestation when a Catholic priest was convicted of molesting boys. This story, the first of two parts, examines the kind of treatment sex offenders can receive from the state.

By WALT STEGMEIR

Daily News Staff Writer

The future home of the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer, the former Thousand Oaks priest convicted of molesting boys, is a pink L-shaped building set among the hills of Atascadero, a small community 18 miles north of San Luis Obispo.

Atascadero State Hospital houses behind three steel doors not only hundreds of sex offenders who prey on children, but also violent rapists and the criminally insane.

Yet despite the violent background of many of the 1,000 hospital patients, staff members, including women, walk down the long corridors unmolested and hospital officials report attacks on staff members are rare.

It is behind these walls of the hospital, for the next months or possibly years, that Roemer will receive therapy and treatment that hospital officials hope will deter the 37-year-old priest from fondling young boys in the future.

Whether Roemer can be cured of his pedophilia — the unnatural desire to molest boys — is an unanswered question. Roemer has admitted to molesting at least 30 boys over a period of 11 years and some experts believe pedophiles cannot be successfully cured of their unnatural desires.

These experts take the position that pedophilia may not be a mental illness but is essentially a lifestyle that never changes.

They say there is no certainty as to the cause of pedophilia, no known cure and no reliable clinical ability to predict future dangerousness.

One well-known expert who takes this position is Dr. Roland Summit of the Harbor-UCLA Medical Center and a recognized authority in the area of child molesting.

During a hearing last year on changing the child molesting laws, Summit described pedophiles as men who have "a lifetime sexual desire for children." The doctor said pedophiles do not come across as criminals or the mentally disturbed, but believe they have the "right and duty" to molest children.

As a result of this viewpoint, there is currently pending legislation in Sacramento to not only lengthen prison sentences for child molesters, but to require that if they are treated at Atascadero that they be returned to prison to serve out their sentence once treatment is completed.

Roemer is under a 10-year, four-month maximum commitment. This is the longest time he could be committed to Atascadero, or if the judge finds he would not benefit from further treatment, be sentenced to state prison.

Ventura County Superior Court Judge Robert Shaw, who found Roemer to be a mentally disordered sex offender and amenable to hospital treatment, has ordered that the first progress report on the priest be filed by Sept. 1.

Roemer will probably be transferred to Atascadero this week according to county jail officials. At Atascadero he will be seen by a psychiatrist and a mental profile will be developed, said David B. Hamilton,

assistant to the hospital medical director.

The hospital staff will then determine what kind of treatment program Roemer should be placed in, Hamilton said. He said this assessment can take 30 days or longer.

There are different treatment programs at Atascadero, Hamilton said. A child molester could end up in the same program as a violent rapist if the program is aimed at solving a basic problem that led to sex crime, Hamilton said.

One program dealing with sex offenders who are judged to be a danger to others, such as Roemer, deals with sex-related problems through group therapy and other consciousness-raising groups and seeks to teach the men self-evaluation and self-discipline, Hamilton said.

There is also a service at the hospital, offered by Dr. Richard Laws, that seeks to cure deviant sexual behavior through aversion therapy.

Deputy District Attorney Joseph E. Taylor, who handled the prosecution of Roemer and did research on treatment offered at Atascadero, explained that it is first determined what kind of sexual activity excites the patient.

Once this is determined, the patient is shown pictures or movies of this kind of sexual activity and when becomes excited an ampule containing ammonia is released, Taylor said. In theory, the patient begins to associate the unpleasant experience of the ammonia with the deviant sexual behavior and no longer is attracted by this kind of sexual activity, Taylor said.

MONDAY: What happens to the victims of child molesters.

Friday, June 1st

Dear Cardinal Manning,

I sure hope that all goes well for you! I appreciated your letter, and the "enclosed" letter.

I was so happy to have not had to spend more than 4½ days at the honor farm (fail) in jail. It was an incredible experience! I arrived here June 4th and was placed in an admissions ward for testing to see what program I'd be placed in and what ward I'd be entering. There were men from all over, - some violent and heavy sedated, and others psychotic and a few "communiabls." I stayed there 10 days because there was no opening on my present ward #4. It's one of the best in the whole hospital. I came here 1 week ago today - all

5778

2

The men here have similar problems & needs, and they're amenable to treatment and seem very friendly. They had differing attitudes & viewpoints (naturally) about me being a priest and gave me a different but silent treatment a while at first. I also was very nervous and had no idea about what to expect. I just need loads of trust and patience. Now, after 1 week, I feel much more comfortable and have made some good friends. I began my first therapy group (11 of us) today and also tomorrow. I have conferences and classes Monday and all next week. I'm just getting "used to" the daily routine.

5779

and already have a job - mopping
our back hall nightly and doing
the "downstch" 3 hours weekly.

I got a hall card now that
insures a little more freedom
to wander through our massive
halls or go to the Canteen, or
also our small chapel. I've met
REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED

after his vacation, I may have
some chance to ask for celebrating
a daily mass + perhaps a Sunday
Eucharist. I hope I can. Our ward
has our own private patio + garden
and a large courtyard borders on
the opposite side. I have a tiny
room and bed + small dresser
where I store my books + papers. It's
not a rectory, but for this "space"
+ growth time in my life, I call
it a home. As long as I can
maintain a positive attitude

5780

I know I can grow and benefit⁴
from what's offered here.


There are definitely some good
programs offered! I know the
House of Affirmation is now interesting,
but the sharing + learning I can
receive from other men here is
invaluable + so I want to "go for it."

I've noted that several of the men
here are "nominal" or "ex" Catholics;
they have asked me to "talk" +
"listen" to their stories "someday."
Here could be a grand opportunity
to very delicately + very gently let the
Lord work.

I pray your summer is a
Blessed one! Thanks for your always
continuing concern + prayers.

Sincerely, Gratefully in our bond,
Pat Roemer

Donald Patrick *[Signature]*
 Davis A
 Atascadero, Ca 92015



[Signature]
 Timothy Andrew Manning
 Consulting Office
 1531 West Ninth Street
 Los Angeles, Ca 90015

5782

APB

Wedn & day 2 in Giv
HB 13/14

REDACTED

REDACTED

Dear

and all,

Your card really helped make my day so much brighter! Thank you for your thoughtfulness and love.

I had 4 1/2 days at the County prison farm - what an experience! Eric & I could never wish for anyone else!

I came there I think ago to lay in one stay and it's so nice to wait for the work, and after testing & evaluation, am assigned to a permanent program (one of nine available) and a dormitory. I'll have a little more freedom there. Here we are locked up from 11pm to 11pm & not let out again till 6:30am. We have an enclosed (iron-barred) gate & live in a single long row of 12 cells a day. Some of the patients are heavily sedated and walk about as zombies. 5 of us were in together last week & are now good friends. The chaplain here, Rev. Charles Smith, is great & has been good to me. Soon I may be allowed to celebrate Mass, but I'm not sure. The chaplain (perhaps from some other

5786

ways I feel the staff in food & the food is very good for a state hospital. I would be of 2 of A's food & I would give a 5 (5)

I hope & pray I can continue to have a good, positive attitude here. I truly feel I can gain something good & valuable here, although I'd rather be somewhere else than have a lot of affirmations. But I'm accepting of being here now. I've been told to expect I'll be here at least 10 days, all the way to 1 1/2 - 2 years. I'm just not sure. All I can do is take things one day (or 1 hour) at a time and not cloud my perception with worries about my future.

Thanks again for your caring & concern. I've never, as never before, how important, valuable, and really beautiful is the fraternity and brotherhood. Love we all must share & do share as people.

May all good things for you in your ministries.

Very Truly,
You brother - Pat Ramsey

5787

Dr. Pat Ramirez
DRAWER "A"
ATASCADERO, CA.
93422



*Parents Pleasant Land
1531 West Ventura St.
Los Angeles, CA 90010*

5788

Re: Rev. Donald Roemer

REDACTED

5785

REDACTED

June 15, 1981

His Eminence Cardinal Timothy Manning
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

Dear Cardinal Manning:

Thank you for meeting with us last month. We appreciate your sincere concern for the protection of our children. Your expressed interest to initiate an educational training program giving lay and religious administrators, teaching staffs, parents and pastors the necessary guidelines and information to help confront the problem of sexual child abuse is desperately needed. We have ignored our responsibility to the victims of this type of crime for too long. The only way we can protect our children is through an informed citizenry.

The enclosed reference material will provide the Superintendent of Education staff with some indepth research and expert opinions on this massive nationwide problem. Our experience in working on this issue in the community has helped us recognize that:

1. Sexual child abuse is a widespread and underreported crime,
2. The victim
 - a) often becomes a runaway because of abuse at home,
 - b) may carry life-long trauma, and some victims are referred to as "psychological time bombs" (refer to Dr. Roland Summit),
 - c) suffers from fear and guilt which often leads them to drugs, prostitution, homosexuality or suicide,
 - d) may become a child abuser
 - e) has very low self-esteem
3. The perpetrator
 - a) most often is a male and can be a respected member of the community (Big Brother, scout leader, teacher, priest, etc.) who has very good relationships with children,
 - b) is often known to the victim, or may be a stranger who kidnaps his victims,

5783

Cardinal Timothy Manning

-2-

June 15, 1981

- c) suffers from low self-esteem and often has been a victim of sexual abuse himself,
- d) has molested children before and is very likely to reoffend
- e) is not considered mentally ill (refer to enclosed psychiatrist research and reports)
- f) may be a pedophile for whom there is no known cure through the mental health profession

We realize that this information may take a while to review. However, we hope that the Department of Education will recognize the urgency of this matter and give it the proper priority.

We will make ourselves available at your convenience to assist in any way and to have a follow-up meeting at any time. Please contact REDACTED or REDACTED at REDACTED

Cordially,

REDACTED

Enclosures

5784

June 23, 1981

Reverend Donald P. Roemer
Drawer A
Atascadero, Calif. 93422

Dear Pat:

In the absence of His Eminence, Cardinal Manning, who will return for a short while in July, and again in August, I wish to acknowledge the receipt of a letter from you, addressed to His Eminence.

Knowing how rushed His Eminence will be during the few days he will be here in July, I thought it best to let you know your letter did arrive. No doubt as soon as he can, the Cardinal will respond.

Please be assured of a continuous remembrance in my Masses and prayers for your intentions.

With kindest personal regards, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Reverend Monsignor John A. Rawden
Chancellor

REDACTED

5777

Atascadero State Hospital
Drawer A
Atascadero, Ca. 93422

REDACTED REDACTED - Hospital REDACTED
Residence

Father Patrick Roemer

REDACTED - Attorney for Father Roemer

Sunday

Dear M usignor Hawnes,

I hope all goes well for you!

Thanks much for your visit last week. It sure did mean a lot. I appreciate your care and concern and taking time to come up here and share with me. I had a "re-occurrence" of sinusitis (worse) & my ear & throat infection. I finally got some antibiotics yesterday and so I'm on the mend.

Have a good week!

Sincerely and Gratefully,
in the Lord,

Pat Roemer

Donald Patrick Kennedy
 Pharr &
 Attorneys 93423



Rev. Mr. Benjamin Sheehan
 Chancery Office
 1531 Great North Street
 Los Angeles, Ca. 90015

(Personal)

5766

August 17th, 1981

REDACTED

Dear REDACTED

It occurred to me that you might wish a word of greeting and reassurance.

Last week I spent more than an hour with Father Pat. I was very relieved to see how reconciled he is to the situation and how much he is cooperating with the therapy that is assigned to him.

I know that these past months have been a time of great anxiety and distress. I have shared to a large extent in those sentiments, yet I trust that God's holy will is in operation here and that much good will come through the darkened clouds.

May God sustain you both in your faith and love.

Very sincerely yours,

REDACTED

Timothy Cardinal Manning
Archbishop of Los Angeles

5767

August 21, 1981

Dear REDACTED

Your gracious and understanding letter was most welcome. Pat was very pleased at your visit to Atascadero State Hospital, and he was most grateful to be able to have a conference with Cardinal Manning. It was a real morale-booster.

REDACTED and I are pleased to be reassured that Pat is responding to therapy, and that his attitude is good. This experience at Atascadero, thankfully, doesn't seem to be the negative one we all feared. We can only assume that this is all part of God's plan.

REDACTED and I will always be grateful for the spiritual, moral, and financial support of Cardinal Manning, and of all of the clergy. The prayers and support of Pat's friends and parishioners have been a source of great edification to all of us.

We too, are filled with hope for Pat, who is truly a zealous and dedicated servant of the Lord. Our prayers that God will allow

him to resume service in His priesthood
in the not too distant future.

REDACTED

and I are thankful for your
concern, and really appreciate your courtesy
in writing to us.

Very sincerely yours,

REDACTED

REDACTED

5764

August 2, 1981

Your Eminence:

REDACTED

and I are deeply appreciative of your letter of understanding and reassurance. Pat was very pleased and "very grateful" for your recent visit to Ottawa General State Hospital - it was a real morale-booster. We have been heartened and encouraged to be reassured that Pat's attitude is good, and that he is cooperating with the therapy. We are hopeful that this process will continue to be beneficial.

We realize that your position has been a most sensitive and difficult one - you have suffered in special ways during these trying times. Our dear Lord has indeed been our refuge and sustained all of us through these difficulties. We are very thankful for your understanding and spiritual and financial support. They have been invaluable to us and have contributed immensely to Pat's progress.

Our fervent prayer is that with God's grace, Pat will be able to resolve his conflicts, be at peace with himself, and be able to resume a productive life in his

service.

REDACTED


and I will be forever grateful
for your compassion and kindness.
May God bless you in all of your
endeavors.

Very sincerely yours,

REDACTED

REDACTED

5762



Footnotes

Atascadero State Country Club?
Box A, Atascadero, CA. 93423
October 30th, 1981.

Dear Cardinal Manning,

I sure hope that all goes well for you and all that's happening in your life (lives).

Thought I'd drop several lines and let you know that I am okay and much seems to be progressing in my life at this moment! As I mentioned last form letter (sorry about these impersonal notes,- but sometimes it's the only way I can adequately answer my mail)- I'm working both in our professional (staff) library and our patient library. Both take lots of "patience." (No pun intended?) It's a challenge to have 50 student psychiatric technicians come in and demand attention, and then 10 doctors and psychiatrists walk in at the same time and ask for different tapes and books or journals on a rare mental illness and of course, I am supposed to know precisely where to find it all! Fun and games and intense neurosis (panic) are my immediate feelings. At least I have a job that helps me combine work, relating to others, and a relaxation from the personal, more intensive therapy that happens in my groups back on the ward.

Speaking of the ward: I just was elected ward government secretary and this means taking and typing minutes and submitting proposals etc. on our own behalf. I enjoy this experience and it helps me reach out more to fellow patients. I am also the chairman of the Ward Relations Committee. This is a more difficult position because when one of us receives a "write-up" for a ward rule violation, then they come in front of a group of us and explain and we note whether it is a valid infringement or not. It does get a little nerve-racking at times. I sometimes get kidded a little; they call me the "gestapo mini-Pope." All in fun, I hope. 99% of my ward is over 6 feet tall!

My personal therapy is moving along well. As I stated before,- becoming my own best friend is an experience vitally important for me. Out of this new honesty and intimacy, I can more validly reach out to fellow adults. Taking life one day at a time is still my motto. Facing myself honestly in front of others is still a challenge. We have a large group twice a week called "therapeutic community." All 38 of us sit around in a circle and bring up our needs and problems. This can be a really "hairy" experience. Yet the risk is worth it in the long wrong.

My gardening is also coming along well; sweet peas, stocks, snapdragons, calendulas, and pansies are all up and near to blooming. I must honestly admit that there are several acres of weeds also!

I don't know anything further about my status here. I have to say that I don't feel that I have gotten the full benefit of this place yet, uncomfortable as it is here. I will be here six months as of December the first. So I just may ask what the staff thinks about my asking to exit from here -- I mean that I have that small possibility when I feel I am ready,- but, of course, they also must agree!!! It will probably be one year before I feel really good about asking this question; who knows, it may come before then? I just cannot be sure. All I can do is consider the NOW and try not to worry about the future! Does this sound therapeutic? I sure do miss all of you and I continually dream about seeing my friends "out there." Have a wonderful week. Always know that you are in my prayers and heart!

your friend,
Pat Roemer

5751

REDACTED

REDACTED

5753

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

—

5754

REDACTED

Wedne^{day} ^{Dec 18/}

Dear Cardinal Manning;

I sure hope and pray all the best for you! I thought I'd make contact and share a little of what has been occurring. I also enclosed a "form" letter I recently wrote - I usually attach a personal note along with it. It's a good way to adequately take care of the letters I get every week (about 40) and yet not be too impersonal. I am just deeply grateful to God for support & prayerfulness from friends.

REDACTED

and REDACTED

Came last week, brought the Eucharist and Anointing of the Sick for me. What a "super-day!" I also

5755

Visited with
REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

about 2 weeks ago and really
enjoyed those experiences. It means a
lot - an oasis amid all the stress
and daily strain of this place. One
of the topics I discussed with
REDACTED

was my feelings about the
House of Affirmation. I know I have the
Archdiocese' backing for eventually
going there. I also know that as of
now, I am going to need more time
to decide if I really feel called to
continue my ministry as a priest in
the future. Actually, I feel I now
will continue, yet I am not totally
sure. I do not feel I can decide that
here. I also know that the H. of
A. is for priests etc. - I was not
sure if the Archdiocese, - or you

5756

3

do understand that I feel a little
 strange asking if I could go there -
 and ^{then} perhaps after one year or so of
 therapy there, decide not to continue,
 at least for some time, or perhaps for
 good, as a priest. I would not want to
 cost the diocese that money etc. -
 Can you see the point I am making?
 REDACTED

stated that he felt
 a money sign would not be placed on
 my head / therapy! I assumed, in a
 way, this to be true. I just felt I
 needed to share with you some of
 my feelings. I wanted you to know
 just what I am thinking. Your interest
 and care for me has been one of the
 primary factors why I feel so "good"
 about my participation here - I feel

5757

4

"close to" the faith-family in which I have come. This is vital especially because so much is going on inside of my mind and heart. I feel that I have gotten lots here already and I trust there's more here. It's very unpleasant at times, but my attitude is still positive and good. I can, as I've stated before, really feel the prayers of so many. I also have (hope) time daily when I can be alone & reflect & pray. Privacy here is very much at a premium - it's so noisy, and participation in groups is highly valued. Yet I've found that personal intimacy & prayer needs "solitude" and that's hard to come by. It's funny, but in the parish I could have been more private & taken the time for personal growth.

5758

time and prayer, and Seldom 5
did that. Now it's harder to do
that & I am doing just that. God
sometimes intervenes & lets us feel &
He grabs us by the neck and gives
a sturdy shake. I am the kind
who needed that at this phase of
my life. I wouldn't (I guess) have
offended like I did if I would have
taken charge of my life earlier and
asked about relationships & myself
more. There are loads of factors and
perceptions involved, and I'll never
have it all totally figured out.
I've gone on long enough. Sorry about
all this, but I trust in some of
my insights and would like to
share them.

5759

My garden is growing well and I
do enjoy getting outside in our cool
& crisp days. It's very clear & beautiful
here and I notice & appreciate the
little, usually un-noted things of every-
day life & nature a lot more!!!

My prayers and thoughts are
really with you. May all go well
for you and all of the Archbishop.
I appreciate REDACTED sending me the
 Tidings every week, and the letters
& scratch papers. As we all say,
Have a great week!

Sincerely & Gratefully In
Our love,

Pat Roemer

5760

1981

Father Patrick Roemer

Dear Pat,

Thanks for your recent letter and the sharing of your thoughts. We keep you in our prayers and are always glad when we hear from someone who has visited with you.

Given the limited horizons within which you presently live it would be unwise for you to make decisions about the outcome of your priestly life. It is best to leave that in the Lord's hands and in His good time.

I leave for Rome on Sunday and will be gone for a week. You are always in my prayers Pat

Very devotedly

Nov. 10. 81

D. Cant. Maccanig

5750

Trauma of molested boys varies

Mon., June 8, 1981/DAILY NEWS

Hospital may discover identities of the others

Attention was focused recently on child molestation when a Catholic priest was convicted of molesting boys. This article, the second of two parts, concerns the trauma that affects victims of molestation.

By WALT STEGMEIR
Daily News Staff Writer

While the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer is undergoing treatment at Atascadero State Hospital, some of his child molesting victims are also undergoing counseling for the trauma they suffered from that Thousand Oaks priest.

Roemer, 37, has admitted to molesting 30 boys during the past 11 years. Fifteen of those 30 have been identified, said Deputy District Attorney Joseph E. Taylor, and the incidents go back about a year.

The victims who have been identified range in age from 6 to 14, and Taylor said some are undergoing counseling for the psychological damage they have suffered. Taylor said he hopes the boys would not suffer any longtime psychological effects.

In many cases, Roemer fondled the boys to obtain sexual gratification, and Taylor said the trauma from this kind of molesting is usually less than in cases in which a man engages in specific sexual acts, such as sodomy, with a boy over a long period of time.

For one boy, however, the fondling continued over a period of several months and the effect on the boy was very destructive, Taylor said. The boy's grades at school went down and the boy did not want to attend church, Taylor said.

It was just recently that the other child molestings, which go back to 1970, came to light. Taylor said there is no way his office can force Roemer to identify them.

Once Roemer is placed in a treatment program at Atascadero State Hospital, however,

doctors have the power to make Roemer try to recall who the other victims are, Taylor said.

If the identification of these boys, who now might be adults, is made, then the question is how to deal with a molestation that occurred years ago, Taylor said.

Taylor indicated the best approach would probably be to find out if there is a potentially damaged child and then proceed from there. The parents of the boys would probably be notified that their sons were molestation victims, Taylor said.

Only recently has there been increased concern about the victims of child molestation. Previously, thousands of dollars were spent treating convicted child molesters at Atascadero and other state hospitals, but little attention was paid to what happened to the victims.

One man who has concerned himself with the victims is Dr. Herman Kagan, director of the children's program for the county mental health department in the Simi-Conejo Valley areas.

Kagan said a boy or girl who is sexually molested by someone he or she trusts often develops very confused feelings, because he or she both trusts the molester but is also frightened.

"When (children are) confused, they feel they have done something wrong," Kagan said. He said one of the purposes of therapy is to help the child

understand this confusion is a natural reaction to trusting someone and then seeing something happen that makes him or her afraid.

In counseling, the doctor tries to explain to the child that he or she is not the one at fault in the molesting and it was the adult's responsibility not to engage in such action, Kagan said. "It is often difficult to convince a child he is not the one at fault."

Kagan said this same kind of confusion also occurs in rape cases and the victim starts to believe she was at fault. It is important to "get the blame shifted to the right party and get the confusion cleared up," Kagan said.

In working with victims of child molesting, Kagan said, parents play a very important supporting role. "If the parents support the child, it certainly makes it a lot easier," Kagan said. Without the parents' support, the child can feel he or she "is not only abused by the abuser, but he is also abused by those who are supposed to provide him with support," Kagan said.

Kagan said child molesting can result in the child's developing doubts about himself and his own worth. "The child thinks he is damaged goods, he is bad," Kagan said.

The damage caused by a child molestation might surface later in life, when the person is in his or her 30s, Kagan said.

Officer wounded on robbery call

PHOENIX (UPI) — A Phoenix police officer suffered a minor gunshot wound to the hand when a liquor store clerk mistook him for a robbery suspect.

Police said an armed man forced Michael El Mani, 21, an employee of Buckeye Liquors, to hand over about \$150 Saturday night.

As the suspect was leaving, El Mani pulled out a .357 magnum revolver and fired a shot, inves-

tigators said. Nearby officers heard the shot and responded to the scene.

As Officer William Heydenreich was approaching the door with a drawn gun, police said El Mani looked up, saw the gun and fired a round — striking the officer in the left hand.

Heydenreich was treated and released. El Mani does not face any charges, investigators said.

... Wednesday 7/1

Dear Monsignor Harper,

I surely hope that all goes well, for God, and all you do! I'm doing "okay," as best I can after being here 9 months today! I may possibly decide to set the "ball rolling" for the process of "opening out" of here in June at my next stepping conference. I had a formal staff review here 2 weeks ago; the results were positive, and these go to the Court. I still have areas of my life to work on here (naturally) but I also do feel I am coming close to the time when I'll feel good about receiving the maximum benefit from what I can part of here. The Ventura County Mental Health Director is also positive, and my lawyer is contacting both my

5733

Edge + the D.A.'s office to test
the climate there.

I also have a need. I am much
down in funds. Would it be possible
to have some money from the
diversi 100 my account in permit
me to go to the Continent and take
care of some business etc. I need to pay
a I.R.S. tax form bill of 151.00
also. I'd appreciate any assistance
you can give me.

Have a good week!

Sincerely in the bond,

Pat Rosen

Dr. C. C. Calkins
Alameda Co. Sta. No. 1000
Box 10
Alameda Co. 94502

5735

March Fifth
1982

Donald Patrick Roemer
ATASCADERO STATE HOSPITAL
Box A
Atascadero, California 93423

Dear Pat:

This is to acknowledge your letter of
last week for which I am indeed most grateful.

I was happy to learn that everything
is going according to plan for you. I can hardly believe that
you have been in Atascadero for nine months. It was good to
learn that the results of your formal staff review were positive.

REDACTED

With personal regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

Reverend Monsignor Benj. G. Hawkes
Vicar General

REDACTED

5732

There 'ay

Dear Cardinal Manning,

I pray that all's well there! I thought I'd say hello in one of my "form letters" and also include my latest progress report - the one that goes to court & my lawyer. I feel this report is positive. I also feel more strongly about going ahead to ask out - at least begin the process in June. It's still crowded & very tense around here. I do have ways of accepting & positively dealing with that.

May all you do, and all the Archdiocese, be blessed. Have a good week.

Gratefully & prayerfully,

Pat Roemer



Visiting Pat

Atascadero State Hospital
Box A, Atascadero, CA. 93423
March 17, 1982.

Dear Cardinal Manning,

I sure hope that all goes well for you and all there! Thought I'd drop some lines and let you know what's happening here. Right now I'm sitting at my desk (job) in the library- I had intended to walk a little in the courtyard today- the only "outside" we have in this place. Spring has been trying to "sprung," but the rain drowned that idea quickly. So, I have a few minutes to myself between classes and therapy groups.

I had another formal staffing conference about three weeks ago. They thought I've made real progress, but need to talk to all the staff members on a more regular basis. We have 13 staff and I missed talking to about 4 of them, so now I will try to set up regular "one to ones" with them all! It's all part of the process here and can be very beneficial. My main "sponsor" (the psychiatric technician who writes your reports and talks to you the most) quit, and I lost my co-sponsor, so now I'm in a completely different group and have two new sponsors. It's nearly like beginning all over again. At first I wasn't too "kean" on this idea, but now I see that it's a chance to continue growing with someone else's input and insights beside me. Since I completed my "sex education" class, I've joined an "Assertiveness skills" group and I am picking up loads of helpful techniques on really getting my needs met in assertive ways. A book that has helped me a great deal with monitoring my "inner talk" and eradicating irrational feelings and emotions is called "A New Guide to Rational Living," by Ellis and Harper. You don't have to have come to a mental hospital to be aided by this book and the process it talks about. I (and our staff) highly recommend this little gem. (No! I don't receive commissions from the psychologist authors!) The psychologist I meet with weekly is a walking book authority (he eats and digests vast volumes weekly- and practices what he reads and preaches too!) and has given me many helpful titles to mull over from month to month. I keep track of a lot of our weekly discussions in a journal. This process of self growth mapping out I find a real experience that I can "have" over and over. I go back and re-read what I wrote about my deepest thoughts, feelings, emotions, musings, experiences, humorous reflections, anecdotes, insights, and etc.....- and I can see growth, regressions, needs fulfilled, insights into my own thinking and feeling processes- it's useful and helps me to keep myself honest.

I have been in some contact with my lawyer and the county mental health department. He has been in contact with the D.A.'s office. I originally had decided to begin the process of "asking out" of here during June, sometime. I am not so sure this is what I will strive for. This comes not from what my lawyer or the court feels, but from within me. I will be here one year in June. Yet I feel there are still some things I want to consider a little more here before I feel strongly ready to ask out. So, I am not sure; all I will do is continue to take it all one day at a time! Sound familiar? I keep saying that, but now that phrases' meaning comes through clearly for me. I feel that if I work for a certain date (an arrival point) then my energies will go towards the arrival, and I could forget the process of getting there- so I want to be a little more "open ended" about it. I hope this letter makes sense- I guess I'm a little "heavy" today. Must be the rainy weather? Please pray I can maintain a good attitude. There's still much tension around here and we are overcrowded as usual. I promise to remember you and your needs daily in my mind and heart. Thanks for your kindness and goodness to me. May all go greatly as time goes on!

Love and prayers and gratitude,

Pat Roemer

over 1

5737

CCI 002821

March 30th, 1982

Reverend Donald P. Roemer
Atascadero State Hospital
Box A
Atascadero, Ca. 93423

Dear Pat:

Easter is the happier for having heard from you. Thank you for the letter and the enclosures. You are never far from our thoughts and our prayers.

It is wonderful that you have kept your spirits up through these difficult months, and I know that you are open to God's will. May He continue to bless you.

Have a happy Easter.

With every best wish, I am

Very sincerely yours,

REDACTED

Timothy Cardinal Manning
Archbishop of Los Angeles

5736

Decision Knots

I'VE DECIDED TO DECIDE TO
REDECIDE WHAT I DECIDED
THAT I NEEDED TO
REDECIDE, I THINK. BUT
BEFORE I REDECIDE, I NEED
TO DECIDE HOW I AM
GOING TO DECIDE TO
REDECIDE, OR ELSE
REDECIDING WILL BE A
DECISION I WILL HAVE TO
REDECIDE BEFORE I CAN
DECIDE MY REDECISION. IN
OTHER WORDS, THE
REDECISION WILL COME
AFTER I DECIDE TO
REDECIDE ABOUT MY
REDECISION. WHAT'S
KEEPING ME FROM
DECIDING IS THAT I CAN'T
DECIDE WHICH DECISION I
NEED TO DECIDE TO
REDECIDE, SO IN THE
MEANTIME I HAVE DECIDED
NOT TO DECIDE TO
REDECIDE THE ORIGINAL
DECISION UNTIL I DECIDE
TO REDECIDE THE DECISION
NOT TO DECIDE.

—THE AUTHORS

Atascadero State Hospital
Box A, Atascadero 93423
May 1, 1982.

Dear Cardinal Manning,

Greetings from the concrete, nuthouse, monastery of the north! Actually don't let this opening greeting throw you; I do take this place seriously. I also try to balance everything off with a good sense of humor!

So much has happened since Easter. The attitudes on our ward had gone downhill. Not too many of us have really tried to discuss it and bring out the reality of what was going on. Four men attempted an escape process; one turned himself in, and the whole ward had to have emergency discussion sessions. Then, last Monday, while one patient was being searched because of a "supposed" drug incident, another patient "discovered" a sharp piece of "contraband" metal on his bunk. This led to our ward's total "lockdown"; just yesterday the doors were once again opened. All this week we were in enforced discussion-therapy sessions together. Many feelings, emotions, thoughts, ideas were expressed, some in violent reactions and others in open communication. It was a tiring, tense, difficult experience. But... It did work! Patients who hardly ever talk to one another sat down and worked things out. Many of us worked long hours to write up commitments that would try to insure communications and provide real tools so that we could together adjust attitudes in ourselves and help others' attitudes change. Now, we will see if we can truly work together. I really got a lot from this week altho it was a very difficult one. Sometimes I just thank God that I am here where I am able to really work on myself and benefit from all that is offered despite the discomfort of this "place."

I still work with the Catholic psychologist about 3 hours per week. This has really helped me out a lot. My parents visit once a month; I talk to them privately for a while, and then Dr. REDACTED works with all of us in a more "therapeutic" way. This is good since one of the problems I have had is this: I need to be "confrontative" with those I really love and care about. This is the commitment I made to the whole ward as part of the resolution stage of the whole problem we have all had lately. (Every ward member also made a specific commitment to our whole body, publicly!) Keeping a good balance between any leisure time I can take and my therapy and work schedule is a goal I continually am aware of.

So, my garden in our little ward courtyard keeps me occupied for a couple of hours weekly. The spring flowers are coloring the corners of the yard and the few vegetables I planted are desperately struggling to poke up through the rocky, hard soil.

Before I close,--- I pray and hope all the best for you and all you do. I remember you all often as I descend with my mind into my heart! May all you do be successful. Have a great week!

Your friend,

Pat. Roemer

5731



WINGS WEST 837-0124

Leave LAX 8:30 a.m. Arrive San Luis Obispo 9:55 a.m. (Stops at Santa Maria)

Leave San Luis O. 12:30 p.m. Arrive LAX 1:45 p.m.
2:00 p.m. 3:15 p.m. " "

This is Beachcraft 99 Jet powered 15 passenger plane

Fare - \$63 each way

\$49 - Economy (limited number of these seats)

IMPERIAL AIRLINES (1-800) 542-6077

LEAVE LAX { 8:15 a.m. { 10:45 a.m.
Arrive San Luis O. { ~~9:40~~ a.m. { 11:05 a.m. (50 minute flight) non stop
9:05

Leave San Luis O. { 2:30 p.m.
Arrive LAX { ~~3:25~~ p.m. non stop
3:20

This is 18 passenger Turbo Prop

Fare - \$61.00 each way

5730

Paso Robles, 15 miles to north
 San Luis Obispo, 17 miles to south.

ATASCADERO STATE HOSPITAL: (Midway between San Francisco and L.A., 3 miles south of Atascadero on Highway 101. Visitor's parking area provided those traveling by car.

Visiting Regulations:

- a. Encouragement given to visiting weekends and holidays.
 If it is wished to talk to staff, visits should be scheduled during week.
 Visiting Hours - 8:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
- b. If staff member is to be contacted such request should be made when registering with receptionist. (During work week.) Suggested that requests for interview with staff member be submitted prior to date of visit, allowing staff member sufficient time to arrange his or her schedule.
- c. Ordinarily all visiting takes place in visiting room within hospital. Patients with grounds privileges may have visits in picnic area on Saturdays, Sundays, Tuesdays and holidays, providing weather permits. Patients not allowed to enter private automobiles.
- d. No article of any kind may be given to a patient or received by a patient without prior permission.

All persons and vehicles entering grounds are subject to search.
- e. Money in any form cannot be accepted in visiting room. Monday through Friday it may be paid directly into patient's account at the Trust Office, or it may be mailed at any time for the patient's account.
- f. No items may be passed between visitor and patient (food, cigarettes, checks, money, medication of any kind, and legal papers). Legal papers must be given to the patient through the Trust Office.

Paso Robles, 15 miles to north
San Luis Obispo, 17 miles to south

ATASCADERO STATE HOSPITAL: (Midway between San Francisco and L.A., 3 miles south of Atascadero on Highway 101. Visitor's parking area provided those traveling by car.)

Visiting Regulations:

- a. Encouragement given to visiting weekends and holidays.
If it is wished to talk to staff, visits should be scheduled during week.
Visiting Hours - 8:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
- b. If staff member is to be contacted such request should be made when registering with receptionist. (During work week.) Suggested that requests for interview with staff member be submitted prior to date of visit, allowing staff member sufficient time to arrange his or her schedule.
- c. Ordinarily all visiting takes place in visiting room within hospital. Patients with grounds privileges may have visits in picnic area on Saturdays, Sundays, Tuesdays and holidays, providing weather permits. Patients not allowed to enter private automobiles.
- d. No article of any kind may be given to a patient or received by a patient without prior permission.

All persons and vehicles entering grounds are subject to search.
- e. Money in any form cannot be accepted in visiting room. Monday through Friday it may be paid directly into patient's account at the Trust Office, or it may be mailed at any time for the patient's account.
- f. No items may be passed between visitor and patient (food, cigarettes, checks, money, medication of any kind, and legal papers). Legal papers must be given to the patient through the Trust Office.

Monday, May 17, 1982.

Dear Cardinal Manning,

I hope and pray that you are well and all goes well for you and the diocese! So much has been happening - that's why I enclosed another of my "crazy" form letters to help with some "updating!"

I have another informal stepping conference on Monday, May 24. I originally had decided to "ask out" (at least initiate the long process) that day. However I feel I'll wait until my next formal conference in August has been. - I've discussed more areas with
REDACTED

Dr. (Catholic psychologist - friend) & my new sponsor-therapist, and I feel good about working now on some areas. I feel happy that my parents come one day per month, and Dr. ^{REDACTED} meets with them and me, and we all find this helpful. Our communication, particularly in the area of my homosexuality has greatly improved. I'm really grateful for all this assistance. I'm still feeling good about giving me a stronger positive yes vote if I wait till August also. I'll be here 1 year on June 3rd. I cannot really say that all of my time here is flying - just "some parts."

Our classes' 12th ordination anniversary is May 23rd. I will celebrate a special

"private" mass this Sunday at 3 pm - some
 stuff + friends here can come. (3-4) at least I
 am allowed to celebrate mass on Christmas,
 Easter + my anniversary. I'll remember you + all
 my class that day in a special way. I'll
 miss being with you next week at the
 Mass we have at the Holy Family Sisters'
 Convent on Manhattan + lunch afterward. That
 day we have "chopped beef" for lunch (yummy,
 but I'll just "pretend" I have shrimp salad,
 "caviar" and wine. (I'll beef up my phantasy
 life that day!) Please remember me also
 at Mass on the day you celebrate with
 my classmates.

I feel I am growing more + more
 as an adult. I thank God for this. I
 also feel I am developing into more of a
 "trusting" person, spiritually, also. I need
 that so very badly. Please tell them
 I said "hi."

Have a good week. May you
 care greatly for yourself and be at peace.

sincerely and gratefully,
 a brother in our heart,

Pat Roemer

May 25th, 1982

Reverend Donald Patrick Roemer
P.O. Box "A"
Atascadero, Ca. 93423

Dear Pat:

I have just come back from the Mass and luncheon which we had with the class of 1970. At the prayer of the faithful, and in our dialogue, we thought of you and prayed for you.

Needless to say, we follow with interest and concern the progress that you are making and know that you will come through this period with great stature.

May God continue to bless you.

With every best wish, I am

Very sincerely yours,

REDACTED

Timothy Cardinal Manning
Archbishop of Los Angeles

5725

aug 1982 Saturday

Dear Cardinal Manning,

Once again, I write to say "hello!" and to share a little more of my situation through the enclosed report from the wonderful Catholic psychologist I've worked with. I thought you may be interested in some of the pertinent observations be made. It may assist in explaining even more some of the details, observations, and statements I made in my longer letter to you of last week.

I hope all's okay for you and all you are doing. I had a surprise, happy visit from
last Sunday.

REDACTED

5713

He's well & traveling all over
 visiting his "far flung" & very "noisy"
 diocese. He'll need a new car
 once a month, or else buy a "personal
 jet" & "pave the front of each Rectory
 for a runway!" I'm okay here -
 it's very uncomfortably hot & even
 being burned! I wish the state
 would "give" us a swimming pool -
 (I must have succumbed to the
heat) We need the cooler weather
 of Ireland here?

Have a great week. My
 prayers are for & with you & our
 diocese. I'm so grateful, for you &
 your support, to God.

sincerely & gratefully
 Pat Roemer


REDACTED

REDACTED

5712

REDACTED

REDACTED

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "J. [unclear]", written in a cursive style.

REDACTED

REDACTED

5711

REDACTED

August 31st, 1982

Reverend Donald Patrick Roemer
Box A
Atascadero, Ca. 93423

Dear Pat:

I have received your two letters of August 20th and 30th.

We share the joy in the progress that you are making and hope that the reentry will be expeditious for you. You have been brave and patient, and I know that God has many recompenses for you.

The expression you used, "walk our talk," I used as a theme over the weekend for a talk on evangelization at the Biltmore Hotel. It was a striking slogan.

With every best wish and renewed assurance of our prayers, I am

Very sincerely yours,

REDACTED

Timothy Cardinal Manning
Archbishop of Los Angeles

5718

REDACTED

REDACTED

5709

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED REDACTED

5710

e.c. REDACTED

Dear Monseigneur Hawker, Tuesday night
at the "Nuthouse."
Nov 1952

I sure hope that all goes well for you, and all you're doing. I manage to stay active and "therapeutic" and continue to grow and take things one day at a time! This process becomes increasingly difficult as I come closer to my possible leaving. In August, I "asked out" & our staff agreed that I have reached benefit - all I can get from in here. I received a recommendation for outpatient status; this coming Tuesday, Nov. 16, at 1:30 pm. I have my final program staff conference. After that, if I am "okayed" formally, I'll soon move up to the less tense & more free "exit" ward to await being called to court for the judges' decision. If he goes along with the staff's

5693

position become a doctor, and own ² ~~country~~ ^{country},
 then I'll have 1 year of outpatient sta-
 tion in Ventura County - I must find a
 job, and get a car & apartment and be
 on my own for that time - going to
 groups once / twice per week for ongo-
 ing therapy etc. I eagerly look for-
 ward to that experience of being out
 and practicing all I've learned in
 here. I am looking & friends also for
 job openings etc. When I will return
 to court? - I cannot be sure. It could
 be soon after Christmas, or between
 Dec. -> March. Paperwork in the state
 system (like the church, eh?!) is
 often complicated, complex, & slow!
 I'll just have to continue being a
 mere "patient" patient!!!

I do have a special request.
 I have depleted most of the funds
 I have. REDACTED, paid for most
 of the books I ordered as part of

my therapy class - groups here. But I have not had any additions to my patient - account since you last came to see me. Would it please be possible to have a check for about \$150.00? I definitely could use it for my own personal needs and small donations I make because I'm part of different groups that now & again have parties or special needs. I thank you for your assistance!

I'd also like to ask - after I leave here, is there a way I could get a loan of some kind from the Archdiocese so I can begin my new life, on my own, outside. I have about \$1400.00 saved up, but I can see that this will not go far in getting on apartment or car & some basic needs met. I

Excuse that perhaps I am a
little "early" in asking, but I
honestly wanted to let you
know how I feel and think
as of now. I'd appreciate any
comments you may have for
me regarding these "thoughts
and questions."

I appreciate your considera-
tion in all these areas.

May all go well for you!

sincerely and gratefully,

Pat Roemer

5696

Nov. 13, 1982

Check payable to ATASCADERO STATE : HOSPITAL

Patient's account

Lower part of check - "For Account of Donald ~~Rutkin~~ Patrick Roemer"

Charge; RELIGIOUS PURPOSES.

5687

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY

5012 EAST SEMINARY ROAD
CAMARILLO, CALIFORNIA 93010TELEPHONE
AREA CODE 805
482-2755

OFFICE OF THE RECTOR

November 16, 1982

Rev. Msgr. John A. Rawden
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

Dear Msgr. Rawden:

In the absence of His Eminence, I am writing to you concerning Father Patrick Roemer. It has come to my attention that he may be released toward the end of December and that he will be required to live within Ventura County.

I would not, of course, offer him the hospitality of the seminary without the approval of His Eminence. I consulted the faculty here, and we are all eager to manifest priestly compassion and concern toward Father Roemer. The faculty was unanimous in its willingness to have Father Roemer stay at the seminary if such be in accord with the wishes of His Eminence and the requirements of law. Our facilities are limited and we would not have a faculty room available, but it seems to me that a student room would be very pleasant in light of his present experience.

I would also find this arrangement to be a very good example to the student body, and I believe that Father Roemer's presence among us would be in accord with a statement I observed in the proposed code to the effect that no difficulties of the priesthood should be kept from seminarians.

Since I presume that you will be charged with making arrangements for Father Roemer, I wanted you to know that we are eager to be cooperative.

Faternally yours in Christ.
REDACTED

Rector

REDACTED

5708

November Sixteenth
1982

Dear Pat;

This will acknowledge your letter of recent date for which I am indeed most grateful. It was good to learn that things are progressing reasonably well and that you are getting more time behind you. Let us hope that the recommendation for outpatient status will be favorably received and acted upon.

Cardinal Manning is presently in Washington attending the Bishops' Meeting, and will go on from there to Rome to attend the meeting called by the Holy Father for all Cardinals. He is expected back in the Chancery on Monday, November 29th. Please be assured that I will give him your letter.

REDACTED

Just as soon as the Cardinal returns I will speak to him about your future needs whenever you leave Atascadero. I am sure that something will be able to be worked out. In the meantime, let us pray that the good Lord will continue to take care of you. I am going to try to arrange to go up to see you before Christmas, and will let you know beforehand.

Praying for you every blessing, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

B

Reverend Monsignor Benj. G. Hawkes
Vicar General

Donald Patrick Roemer
ATASCADERO STATE HOSPITAL
Box A
Atascadero 93423

5692

File

November Sixteenth
1982

Dear Pat:

This will acknowledge your letter of recent date for which I am indeed most grateful. It was good to learn that things are progressing reasonably well and that you are getting more time behind you. Let us hope that the recommendation for outpatient status will be favorably received and acted upon.

Cardinal Manning is presently in Washington attending the Bishops' Meeting, and will go on from there to Rome to attend the meeting called by the Holy Father for all Cardinals. He is expected back in the Chancery on Monday, November 29th. Please be assured that I will give him your letter.

REDACTED

Just as soon as the Cardinal returns I will speak to him about your future needs whenever you leave Atascadero. I am sure that something will be able to be worked out. In the meantime, let us pray that the good Lord will continue to take care of you. I am going to try to arrange to go up to see you before Christmas, and will let you know beforehand.

Praying for you every blessing, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

REDACTED

Reverend Monsignor Benj. G. Hawkes
Vicar General



Donald Patrick Roemer
ATASCADERO STATE HOSPITAL
Box A
Atascadero 93423

5691

Sunday 16 Nov 82
night

Dear Cardinal Manning,

I send my greetings and best to you! I pray that all goes well for all you are involved in.

This Tuesday I have my last formal meeting with program staff - called "dispositional staffing." If all goes well there, I have soon to be in it ward + wait till I am called back to court. That probably will be after Christmas "anytime". Of course, "anytime" means just that. In the state bureaucratic system, it could mean after the "Second Comng." because of paperwork. I've heard it expressed among Christian staff here (in the minority) that "paperwork" is holding up the return of the host. I just continue to be a patient - patient. Now that I know our

5697

stuff well & they clearly see my
sense of humor (so vital here, or one
could actually become a genuine "nut!")
they often ask me to translate odd
little sayings into Latin, of all things.
"Misabili ductu" was has, of all things,
found its way into several official
reports etc. Some patients, and non-
practicing Catholics, often can be
heard singing "Holy God" & "O Salva-
tus" in our showers, especially as
I enter to wash. (they should,
actually, sing the "Veni aqua.")
I'll have to show that. All of this
actually does happen.

About 5 weeks ago, I received
my white card, i.e. - my "Grand per-
sons card." I'm the only man on
this ward in 3 years who's had one.
Naturally, I was the butt of lots of
jokes, & sometimes rather funny at -

tasks & comments. Some put the ³
 pipe paid for me to get it etc. It
 means I can leave our building & walk
 outside (a wonderful treat) and have
 picnic (see, genuine homemade food!)
 with friends in our private kitchen
 beautiful picnic area. I much enjoy
 this privilege. I also "pay" for it
 in 1 way. I work from 4 a.m. till
 10:00 a.m. Mon - Friday as a "housekeep-
 ing maintenance engineer." Translated
 more practically & more honestly, I am
 a janitor. I clean toilets, hallways &
 stuff apartments outside on our outer
 grounds. In order to gather enough
 motivation to arise that early, I
 pretend I'm a "monk" who gets up to
 chant the office. Actually, as I
 work, because I'm alone, I can &
 do pray. What comes to mind now

5699

often than not as I clean all these⁴
 toilets is "out of the depths (water).
 I cry to you, O Lord!" And, I always did
 like being near the water!" I am
 paid 60¢ per hour + I'm trying to save
 it. I could use it. I weeks ago I had a
 rapid interview with a Consultant who's
 writing a professional resume for me. to
 assist me in the job field after I
 leave here. She convinced me, because of
 all my background, that I have a lot
 of transferable employment skills, espe-
 cially in person oriented fields - helping
 others, personnel, education, writing etc.
 It's a very interesting experience - to
 be helped in seeing yourself from many
 different angles.

Dr. REDACTED

my psych. friend, is
 still helping me a lot, - + my parents.
 They are coming this Thursday for a
 picnic + some therapy. (desert,

5700

Please remember my dad at prayer - he's
 not here too well lately. He spent
 1 1/2 weeks at the V. A. Hospital - had a
 major stroke, & his carotid artery is
 completely blocked. His better now.
 They plan surgery in one year. My
 parents thank (& pray) very highly
 of you - especially your personal kindness
 to our family at the time of Father
 REDACTED
 ' death.

I guess I'll sign off now. I
 much appreciate your "listening."
 I pray that the Lord blesses you
 in every way, day by day. I do get
 to celebrate a private Mass at Thank-
 giving. You'll have a special remembrance.
 I have so much to be grateful for. One
 of the most beautiful experiences I
 am having here is (now) my daily
 walk outside alone - I sit on a

5701

bench do near the old pond & let the warm sun gently surround me with a radiant sensation and I can think about what a chance I've been given to cooperate & grow more integrated & try to help myself. I know that others are sent to prison. I am here. God is truly good. Even if I was in prison, God is still always good. Maybe I am learning to really trust all over again & even more deeply. I feel my spiritual life is more real & livable. Sometimes I am not sure just where I am at, but I am searching. I feel I need a retreat, but I guess in some ways, I've been on one.

Sincerely and Gratefully,
 a brother in Christ,
 Pat Roemer

Monday, Nov. 2nd

'82

Dear Admiral Manning,

"Another" letter from me....

I guess I've had so much on my mind lately. I hope your trip to Rome was successful & very pleasant. Since I was "positively stopped" last week, I've met with my social worker. He needs to know exactly where I'll live right after I leave here, & if I'm granted the outpatient status by the judge. I just need a place to stay for about 4-6 weeks - I wonder if I could live in residence at St. Johns' during that time, as a "transition place" until I am settled "independently" at my own apartment & can find a job etc. & get a car of my own.

5688

REDACTED

I previously wrote ^{home & 2} asked about this possibility. He said this question is up to you + the faculty there. I do want to know as soon as possible so my paperwork can be sent off to the County; if the answer is no, I do understand! I would appreciate hearing your feelings and reasons soon. If I cannot stay at St John's, I'll look elsewhere - possibly at my parents' house in ^{REDACTED} I feel St John's would be a good choice because I could more easily make the transition back into my own, independent experience in "society" by living near fellow-friends as I look for a job + an apartment in the county area.

5689

2
" Thank you for your consideration
in this area. I always am
appreciative of your kindness
towards me.

May you be blessed in
all you do!

Sincerely and Gratefully
in love and,
Pat Roemer

5690

"Second Chance" A Personal Testimony of God's Mercy," by Pat Roemer

I just finished reading over my journal which had become like a close friend during my 22 months in a mental hospital. After I finished recalling the pain, struggles and joys I found there, tears welled up in my eyes. I clearly realized that the Lord truly had mercy on me. He gave me a second chance. Once a trusted person, I betrayed that trust by a serious crime. Instead of being sentenced to prison, I was sent to a state hospital. I used my time there well, motivated by a strong sense of God's mercy. I benefitted from the treatment and was freed in 22 months.

He Made His Home With Me

Before my time in the hospital, I recall how critical and even condemnatory I was of other peoples' faults. I read the newspapers, for example, and was very quick to criticize another's wrongdoing. I can see that until I had experienced the Lord's mercy towards me- and I was the one needing his mercy and forgiveness all along- I never actually had any true empathy and mercy for anyone else. I like to look on mercy as the gift of God "being present" to me, i.e., the Lord "making His home with me." This is why the story of Zacchaeus is one of my favorites (Luke 19: 1-9). This little man, a public sinner, climbed a tree to see the Lord. Jesus met him where he "was at,"- a sinner in need of mercy. He told him "Hurry down, Zacchaeus, because I must stay at your house today." Jesus loved him and made his home with him. To me, this is what Jesus did for me. He did not turn me away. He made his home with me through all the difficult experiences I was encountering. I felt His merciful presence and knew I was not alone and because of this, I progressed.

Making Room for Others in My Heart

Since I received His mercy as a gift, I can now extend to others what I first received. Believe me, when I find another person in need of the mistakes they have made, I can feel a little of what they feel and be a merciful person in dealing with them. This experience reminds me of "hospitality." Hospitality means making room for someone in your heart, so to speak. The Lord made room for me in His heart; he shared my house. Now I

p. 2

can be hospitable to anyone who comes to me with a need. I can find room in my heart for them and reach out to them in any way I can.

There were times that I felt tempted to give it all up and toss in the towel, clam up, and no longer participate in therapy sessions. It was then that I recalled how easily I could now be sitting in prison where there is no chance for help. Most of the time, my attitude was positive wince I experienced the Lord's mercy as a "second chance." In the hospital, I could get help. Prison would have meant more suffering and possibly death. I felt that God's mercy was spoken through my judge's final words at my last hearing when he said "If any man could benefit from treatment, this man can." I will never forget that. How good and merciful is the Lord!

One Day at a Time

One of the most relevant experiences that I remember was learning to take things just one day at a time. Some days seemed like an eternity as I delved into myself and faced areas of my life that I had tried to forget for so long. The therapeutic process seemed endless: I had so many problems. However, the more I looked to the front door (release) and was not true to the daily process of growth, the harder it got. As I relaxed more and more and took things one day at a time, my attitude changed. I can honestly say that my realization that God was "with me" motivated me to accept myself and freed me to work on my problems and not worry about "getting out." This realization buoyed me up and enabled me to face the now of each day and thus gradually begin to grow into the person He had originally called me to be.

The Grace-Filled Circle of Mercy

In the Beatitudes Jesus does say that mercy will come to those who give it. (Matthew 5:7). It seems to me that a beautiful cycle is begun and continued in all of this. I feel and receive the Lord's mercy; now I can reach out and share what I received as a gift with others. If I then give this mercy as a gift, I will again receive it. I need mercy, and I receive it. I give it, and receive it again. This is the opposite of the "vicious circle," an end to the Old Testament law of retaliation,—"An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth." This is what we can call a "grace-filled" circle. "Happy are those who are merciful to others, God will be merciful to them" How beautiful.

How can I practice this mercy? I find that the evening news is a good place to start. We are always hearing about murderers, thieves, rapists and sometimes I find it easy to start condemning and assigning them to prison, hell, and other places. Wow, and here I was once myself in front of a judge. How can I ever pass judgement on others? Because I have personally experienced God's mercy, I am far less critical of others in trouble. I "fell" but was offered through God's mercy a chance to pick myself up and live again.

p. 3

Give Freely What You Have Received Freely

A few statements from my journal may help to illustrate my feelings a little more in detail:

"I note that for the first time I can tell about my inner fears and accept them as such and not be so judgemental and condemnatory of myself. Thank God, I have this chance; maybe God's mercy is being accepted as a gift."

"I have many painful feelings and thoughts about myself. I find it hard to accept that I did offend and hurt many people. I judge myself very cruelly and tend to give myself many reasons for not loving myself and to feel sorry and have loads of self pity. This will not help me to grow at all. I can be a loving person, caring and sensitive, yet my actions were not that way. I need to learn the meaning of mature, adult love."

On some particularly difficult days, I used to reflect on the little things in life that I began to appreciate as never before.....

"One thing I noted lately.. all the little gleams of joy that come from experiencing the little things... The beauty of rain and a few flowers in the cracks of the courtyard concrete and that REDACTED

gave me a little plant and flower book yesterday. I so much enjoy and appreciate these little gestures. In here, it's these things that seem to awaken my feelings that things are okay and God is so very good to me."

I was so fortunate to have many friends visit me while at the hospital. I wrote: "I am overwhelmed with a feeling of joy and gratitude that I have many people outside of this place who call for me. God's mercy is so full."

I offer these thoughts and reflections as a way to help you personally reflect on God's mercy in your life. I am sure that my thoughts could be repeated over and over as the experiences of so many people regarding the special ways God has shown His mercy.

The important thing is to recall God's mercy and to be grateful. Then..... give as a gift what you and I have received as a gift. May we all be blessed in our efforts to do just that.

Give thanks to the Lord, for He is good. His mercy endures forever.

5620

There has been a proposal
that he might live at
the Seminary in Camarillo.

- I do not agree with
that.

- If he is to be housed
in some religious place
I would suggest that
he go to Ojai - (Brother)

REDACTED

tells me

that he is waiting for an
answer about Camarillo -
but that it would be better
to tell him orally rather
than in writing.

- I think he is expecting a visit
from you.

File

MEMORANDUM

TO: Monsignor Rawden
 FROM: Monsignor Connolly *ce*
 RE: Pat Roemer
 DATE: January 5, 1983

The Cardinal suggested that an appropriate residence which might be considered for Pat Roemer in the Ventura County area would be the St. John of God facility in Ojai.

Just a suggestion.

Is he home, yet?

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

*Head of mental health
 No word yet on release
 from Atascadero 24 Jan 83*

- 1) *Dr. [REDACTED]*
- 2) *Hearing date: 3 February 83*
- 3) *Next hearing date: Tues, March 29*
- 4) *Next hearing date: Mon, April 11*
- 5) *May 12*

5683

January Twenty Fourth
1983

Dear Pat:

In case you have not yet contacted the Brothers of St. John of God at Ojai concerning the possibility of staying with them, their address is as follows:

REDACTED - REDACTED
St. Joseph's Convalescent Hospital
2464 East Ojai Avenue
Ojai, California 93023
Phone: REDACTED

REDACTED REDACTED and I were delighted to see you looking so well and looking forward to possible release in the not too distant future.

Trusting that this finds you well, and with personal regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

Reverend Monsignor Benj. G. Hawkes
Vicar General

REDACTED

Donald P. Roemer
Atascadero State Hospital
Box A
Atascadero, California 93422

MEMORANDUM

TO: CARDINAL MANNING
FROM: MONSIGNOR RAWDEN
DATE: FEBRUARY 28, 1983
RE: PATRICK ROMER

REDACTED REDACTED called my office this morning to inform us
that Father Romer's hearing is set for this Thursday, March 3, 1983.

REDACTED EDACED is going to attend the hearing and will
report the results to my office on Thursday afternoon.

REDACTED

To _____

Date 2-28-83 Time 9:58

WHILE YOU WERE OUT

REDACTED REDACTED

M. _____

of San Buenaventura Mission

Phone _____

	Area Code	Number	Extension
TELEPHONED			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CALLED TO SEE YOU			<input type="checkbox"/>
WANTS TO SEE YOU			<input type="checkbox"/>
RETURNED YOUR CALL			<input type="checkbox"/>
PLEASE RETURN CALL			<input type="checkbox"/>
WILL CALL AGAIN			<input type="checkbox"/>
URGENT			<input type="checkbox"/>

Message Will be attending hearing
on Thurs. AM. - Is pretty sure
it will be an in County place-
ment. Will call again
Thurs. PM with results.

REDACTED

FORM 91 Operator _____

associated stationers & printers (213) 622-4162

5680

MEMORANDUM

TO: CARDINAL MANNING
FROM: MONSIGNOR RAWDEN
DATE: FEBRUARY 28, 1983
RE: PATRICK ROMER

REDACTED EDACED called my office this morning to inform us
that Father Romer's hearing is set for this Thursday, March 3, 1983.

REDACTED REDACTED is going to attend the hearing and will
report the results to my office on Thursday afternoon.

3-3-82
REDACTED REDACTED called this afternoon, said there was
nothing to report.
REDACTED

REDACTED

5679

positive recommendation, and now County, County's
then I'll have 1 year of outpatient sta-ta-
tus in Ventura County - I must find a
job, and get a car + apartment and be
on my own for that time - going to
groups ^{and} ^{twice} per week for ongoing
therapy etc. I eagerly look for-
ward to that experience of being out
and practicing all I've learned in
here. I am looking + ^{friends also} for
job openings etc. When I will return
to court? - I cannot be sure. It could
be soon after Christmas, or between
^{Dec} Dec. → March. Paperwork in the state
^{system} system (like the church, eh?!) is
often ^{unpleasant} complicated, complex, & slow!
I'll just have to continue being a
new "patient" patient!!!!

I do have a ^{special} request.
I have depleted most of the funds
I have. REDACTED ^{paid} for most
of the books I ordered as part of
books

3
 my things ^{classes -} classes - groups here. But
 I have not had any additions to
 my patient - account ^{since} since you last
 came to see me. Would it please be
 possible to have a check for about
 \$150.00? I definitely could use it
 for my own personal needs and small
 donations I make because I'm part of
 different groups that ^{now} now & again have
 particular or special needs. I thank
 you for your assistance!

I'd also like to ask - after
 I leave here, is there a way I
 could get a loan of some kind
 from the Archdiocese so I can be-
 gin my ^{new} new life on my own, outside.
 I have about \$1400.00 saved up,
 but I can see that that will not
 go far in getting an apartment or
 car & some ^{basic} basic ^{needs} needs met. I
 ?

realize that perhaps I am a
 little "early" in asking, but I
 honestly wanted to let you
 know how I feel and ^{the way} think
 as of ^{now} now. I'd appreciate any
 comments you may have for
 me regarding these "thoughts
 and questions."

I appreciate your considera-
 tion in all these ^{areas} areas.

May all go well for you!

sincerely and gratefully,
 Pat Roemer

+ AB

MEMORANDUM

RE: REV. DONALD P. ROEMER

DATE: 3 MARCH 1983

Today REDACTED REDACTED called the office to inform us that the Roemer case had been put back for another week, when they will clarify the status - either D.M.S.O or Criminal Code. REDACTED REDACTED will call back next week when he hears the results of the case.

John A. [unclear]

5678

Tuesday

Dear Cardinal Manning,

Greetings in the midst of Lent! I hope the chancery is still "afloat" and not under too much water. It's been so wet here that mosses & fungi are nearly growing on our coal, concrete walls! At least it's green in honor of the coming St. Patrick's Day. I'll be "39" that day (truly!), and probably remain in that status for several years to come.

I still "wait", as usual, for a decisive resolution to my case. Last Thursday, I was assigned my former judge - this is good because he is fair & honest. He recently had a triple bypass heart surgery, so perhaps this brush with his mortality can keep him

a chair + perhaps now understand²
 ing judge. (I can always hope).
 The outcome could be - 1) coming
 back here for more time, or 2)
 outpatient status for 1 year, or 3)
 probation for 1 year with a provision
 for mental health therapy, 4) County
 jail for 6 months - 1 year. The
 latter is our D.A.'s office
 plan, and even if I do get the
 outpatient status, the D.A. will
 still recommend a jail term after-
 wards because he does not consider
 this place any punishment. (I could
~~possibly~~ ^{cordially} invite him here for a
 brief visit + he just may change his
 viewpoint?!) Whatever is decided,
 I feel I'll accept well. If I do
 get jail - maybe I could qualify
 for the work furlough program.
 Then I could go out + work in
 the daytime + be incarcerated at
 night.

I still take all my classes

and groups, and have even picked ³
 up some cooking + independent
 living skills classes that are
 really great! Some day I'll invite
 you for dinner, I guess you'd best
 think twice about that offer!!!
 I still arise daily at 3:30 a.m.
 for (no! not monastic prayer) my
 work, janitorial work, in the front
 main lobby. I've accumulated vast
 sums of money (I am paid 60¢
 an hour, so I now accrue \$44.00 per
 month), - please do not inform
 Monsignor Hawkes as I may end
 up having some taken out - just
 kidding.

I pray all the best for you
 and the diocese. May all you do
 be successfully blessed.

Sincerely + Gratefully,
 In Our Lord,

Pat Roemer

Donald Patrick
 Box A
 Atascadero, Ca. 93423



Long

Timothy Cardinal Manning
 Archbishop of Los Angeles
 Chancery Office, 1531 West Ninth Street
 Los Angeles, Ca. 90015

John
Thur
 REDACTED

5675

To			
Date	3-10-83	Time	11:15
WHILE YOU WERE OUT			
M	REDACTED	REDACTED	
of	Ventura		
Phone	REDACTED REDACTED		
	Area Code	Number	Extension
TELEPHONED			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CALLED TO SEE YOU			<input type="checkbox"/>
WANTS TO SEE YOU			<input type="checkbox"/>
RETURNED YOUR CALL			<input type="checkbox"/>
PLEASE RETURN CALL			<input type="checkbox"/>
WILL CALL AGAIN			<input type="checkbox"/>
URGENT			<input type="checkbox"/>
Message	<p>The next hearing is set for Tues. March 29th. Will be attending that one and inform you.</p> <p>Did you write memo to HAB as I told you to do.</p>		
FORM 91	Operator		

associated stationers & printers (213) 622-4162

5677

MEMORANDUM

TO: CARDINAL MANNING
FROM: MONSIGNOR RAWDEN
DATE: MARCH 11, 1983
RE: PATRICK ROMER

REDACTED REDACTED telephoned my office yesterday morning to inform us the next hearing is set for Tuesday, March 29th.

REDACTED REDACTED plans to attend the hearing and inform us of the results.

REDACTED

5676

Father Donald P. Roemer

March 25, '83

Dear Tat,

Thanks for the recent
letter. We are following
with much interest the hopes
you have. - our prayers are
with you. May you have a
happy Easter and Resurrection.

Sincerely Carl. Manning

MEMORANDUM

TO: CARDINAL MANNING

FROM: MONSIGNOR RAWDEN

RE: FATHER PATRICK ROEMER

DATE: 29 MARCH 1983

Your Eminence:

REDACTED REDACTED called this morning to inform us
that the Roemer case will continue until 11 April 1983, as
there was no report sent from the hospital.

5670

MEMORANDUM

FROM: MONSIGNOR RAWDEN
TO: CARDINAL MANNING
RE: REV. DONALD PATRICK ROEMER
DATE: 13 APRIL 1983

Your Eminence:

This day REDACTED REDACTED called to inform us that Father Roemer will be leaving Atascadero, and will be staying at St. Joseph Hospital, Ojai. He has been released on his own recognizance.

A hearing will take place on Thursday, 12 May 1983, with two possibilities: jail or probation.

The name of the Deputy District Attorney is Joseph Taylor.



SAINT JOSEPH'S CONVALESCENT HOSPITAL

HOSPITALER BROTHERS

P.O. Box 760 - 2464 EAST OJAI AVENUE

OJAI, CALIFORNIA 93023

Phone (Area 805) 646-1466

Monday, Aug. 18, 1983

Dear Cardinal Manning,

I hope that your "ad limina" visit to Rome was a positive and blessed experience for you.

I am so happy to have been let out of Atascadero by Judge Shaw until my May 12th sentencing date, that I wanted to say "hello" and share that news and joy with you. I feel so grateful to be allowed to stay at such a very beautiful and comfortable place. The Brothers are very kind and thoughtful toward me. I cannot leave here (as a condition of my "o.s." status) except to visit my lawyer in Ventura or the probation officer. I work with him because he must make a recommendation to Court on my future plans + needs. We hope the Judge grants me probation and not jail. My parents drove up from REDACTED on last Wednesday and brought me down. After 2 years, I marveled at the beauty of the overall covered beds etc. This is a gorgeous season of the year, naturally as well as tangentially!

I spend my days here reading, writing, praying (they have a very new chapel - very prayerfully done) relaxing, talking and just doing nothing.



Where Good Care Is a Tradition...

5663

I can use a good dose of that right now. Yesterday I had some visitors from former parishes in Santa Barbara & 1000 Oaks. It's raining very heavily now, so I guess I'll not get to use the pool just outside my room for some time. (At least it'll be properly filled up!) I miss some of my stuff and fellow-patient friends from Atascadero, but I do not miss the "place".

Have a good week, and I pray that all continues to go well for you and all you do. Again, - I am thankful for your kind concern and prayerful interest and supportiveness.

very sincerely,
a brother in Christ,

Pat Ramey

Monday



SAINT JOSEPH'S CONVALESCENT HOSPITAL

HOSPITALLER BROTHERS

P.O. Box 760 - 2464 EAST OJAI AVENUE

OJAI, CALIFORNIA 93023

Phone (Area 805) 646-1466

Dear Monsignor Hawkes,

I hope all goes well for you! Now that I am "settled in" here, I thought I'd say "hello" and let you know what is happening. I feel very grateful and happy that Judge Shew gave me an "o. r." status until my sentencing date on May 12. I must stay here on the grounds, and leave only to see my lawyer or the probation officer. I hope that the judge grants me probation with the provision I work with the outpatient staff. Then, I can look for an apartment or place to live and begin my job at "S.C.R.C." if the judge approves. I will need assistance with transportation then. I'll keep you informed as to what develops. Meanwhile, I am enjoying my stay here; the Brothers are truly kind and "hospitable". Have a great week.

Sincerely and Gratefully,
Pat Roemer

5662

Where Good Care Is a Tradition . . .



April Twenty First
1 9 8 3

Dear Pat:

May I take this opportunity to thank you for your letter of last Monday. Needless to say, I was pleased to know that you were settled at St. Joseph's. Your attorney had advised me that your parents were going to pick you up and make certain you arrived o.k. Just as soon as you learn the decision made on May 12th we will be in much better position to determine your needs at that time.

I am going out of the country for the first ten days in May but will be back in the office on the 13th. Continue to enjoy your stay at St. Joseph's. It is certainly a beautiful area.

Praying for you every blessing,
I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Reverend Monsignor Benj. G. Hawkes
Vicar General

REDACTED

Pat Roemer
ST. JOSEPH'S CONVALESCENT HOSPITAL
P. O. Box 760
Ojai, California 93023

5661

To _____
Date 4-25-83 Time _____
WHILE YOU WERE OUT
REDACTED
M. _____
of W/Ventura County
Phone _____
Area Code _____ Number _____ Extension _____
TELEPHONED ☒
CALLED TO SEE YOU ☐
WANTS TO SEE YOU ☐
RETURNED YOUR CALL ☐
PLEASE RETURN CALL ☐
WILL CALL AGAIN ☐
URGENT ☐
Message _____
_____ FILED _____
_____ APR 26 1983 _____
_____ RECEIVED _____
_____ REDACTED _____
FORM 91 Operator _____
associated stationers & printers (213) 622-4162

5659

THE CHANCERY OFFICE
1531 West Ninth Street
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015

April 27.83

Dear Pat,

Thanks for your letter. Glad
you are settled in Ojai. We will be
praying for you on May 12 - may it
be an 'Ascension' to peace

— David R. Roemer

— D. R. Roemer

Reverend Patrick Roemer
St. Joseph's Convalescent Hospital
P.O. Box 760
Ojai, Ca. 93023

5658

CONFIDENTIAL

File
→
TO: CARDINAL MANNING *✓ seen*
FROM: MONSIGNOR RAWDEN
RE: FATHER ROMER
DATE: MAY 26, 1983

REDACTED REDACTED telephoned my office at 1:15 pm today to inform us on the outcome of today's hearing, it lasted three hours. There was a Dr. REDACTED present at the hearing.

The judge gave Father Romer a suspended sentence with ten years probation. He will be reporting regularly to Mr. REDACTED Ventura Co. Probation Office.

Father Romer was informed that he would be subject to "Search and Seizure" with out warning.

Secondly, that he must be accompanied by another adult if he goes anywhere there are children.

Third, Father Romer must make restitution for court costs as follows: \$1,260 for the REDACTED Case and \$1,770 for the REDACTED Case. The Judge, however did not close that part of the case, so there is a possibility some of the other parents may come forward.

The review hearing is scheduled for Monday, November 21, 1983.

REDACTED

5657

Priest who molested children gets probation

By Gregg Zoroya

A Thousand Oaks priest convicted in 1981 for child molestation today was given 10 years of strictly supervised probation.

The Rev. Patrick Roemer, 38, of St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church, was given a suspended prison term of eight years and three months and placed on probation by Superior Court Judge Robert Shaw.

Shaw noted that Roemer had already served two years in custody at Atascadero State Hospital, where he was committed after his conviction in 1981. He molested the children in 1980.

In addition, Deputy District Attorney Joe Taylor successfully sought restitution for the victims' families to help parents pay for therapy.

Testimony today by several of those parents was very critical of the Catholic archdiocese.

The parents testified about their children's suffering, and blamed the Catholic Church for doing nothing to help them.

"We thought the church would step forward and say, 'Hey, what can we do to help?' But they haven't done a damn thing," said the father of a 14-year-old boy who was molested by Roemer.

During a tense moment this morning, one boy's mother testified that her distraught son finally told her, on Christmas Day 1980, about being mo-

lested by Roemer several months earlier.

Her son told her that, during a church-sponsored camping trip in San Bernardino County, he was molested at night in the cot where he was sleeping.

She quoted her son as saying: "As he (Roemer) was talking about how wonderful God was...he started moving his hands down into my pants."

The woman said her son felt something was wrong with him, that he had done a terrible thing.

The parents entered their sons in therapy programs, but several said they can no longer afford the payments. All the parents talked about how the molestations had changed their children's personalities, and their own views of the church.

"Did you look to the church...for support, help and assistance?" Taylor asked one mother.

"I did," the woman answered. "I called Catholic Social Services and told them. And they said they couldn't get involved."

"In fact, I wrote a very long, appealing letter to Cardinal (Timothy) Manning, and I got a brief note back from his secretary saying they would pray for us...I was heartbroken."

Then she added: "After two years, they (church officials) have done nothing."

Thursday note

Dear Monsignor Hawkes,

Thanks very much for your letter (a quick response). The encouragement, information and gift of money are all appreciated!

I did have my final program stopping conference Tuesday, and I "passed." I was approved, & so within 3 months (or so) I could return to court for final decision. I'm very happy and also "laze." I'd appreciate your passing that letter on to the Cardinal at his return, as you said. I apologize: You did send me that check for the S.R.S. I'm sorry I "forgot." You mentioned about trying to get up to see me before Christmas - If you are able, I'd really enjoy that. I had a visit

5638

from my parents today. I went
well. They visit every 4 or 5 weeks.

May all go well for you! I
hope + pray your Thanksgiving will
be a special day.

Sincerely + Lovingly,
your brother in Christ,
Pat Roene

5639

explained when Northridge civic leaders announced plans to cover a bare wall with a gigantic multicolored mural. The mural features powerful symbols of personal growth, spiritual renewal and dedication toward a goal—traditional themes in Mexico, where Pueblo learned his craft.

Residents near the 10-by-97-foot parking lot wall angrily called the mural "a few even wanted to call the mural."

"It was nothing to be worried about," said Juan Pueblo, the Mexican artist entrusted to design the mural.

"The message of the painting is to show that you can have fun and that you can have fun if you are willing to work through the complaints ended."

The product of four months' work, the mural will be unveiled at 10:30 a.m. June 11. It will include music, food and local officials and civic leaders. The mural is considered a bright spot in this section of Northridge, which some police feel is crime-ridden. The south side of the 19000 block of

Parthenia Street, the mural features powerful symbols of personal growth, spiritual renewal and dedication toward a goal—traditional themes in Mexico, where Pueblo learned his craft.

"Juan came up with a topic primarily designed to help youngsters avoid the frustrations that can lead to involvement with gangs," said one of the mural's three lead painters, Augustine Bravo, 28, of Van Nuys, "that they should reach for a better tomorrow."

Local youngsters, some of them street-gang members, lent a hand patching holes and painting.

"By inviting the public to paint with us," Pueblo said, "we turned this into a cultural movement."

Project sponsors included the county Department of Mental Health, the Los Angeles City Mural Project, Neighborhood Approach to Positive Action, the Kiwanis Club of Northridge, Napa Street Elementary School and the Los Angeles Police Department.

—LOUIS SAHAGUN

Times photographs
by Joel P. Lugavere



Artist Juan Pueblo

Convicted Priest Named in Earlier Molestations

Records Show Roemer Admitted Homosexual Acts With Santa Barbara Boys

By JAMES QUINN, Times Staff Writer

A former Thousand Oaks parish priest who last week was placed on 10 years probation for molesting 15 local boys has admitted to molesting an equal number of youngsters during an earlier assignment in Santa Barbara, according to court documents.

The Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer, a 39-year-old admitted homosexual, reportedly made the new admission during interviews with Ventura County Probation Department staff members prior to his sentencing by Ventura Superior Court Judge Robert L. Shaw.

According to the interviews, Roemer admitted molesting about 15 young boys during assignments at two Santa Barbara-area Catholic parishes between 1970 and 1978.

In pre-sentencing interviews, Roemer also told probation officers that he twice sought help from priest-counselors in Santa Barbara and that he told the counselors about his child molestation.

No charges were filed in Santa Barbara against Roemer, according to Ventura County prosecutors.

Roemer, known affectionately as "Father Pat" to youths he counseled at St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church in Thousand Oaks from 1978 to 1981, pleaded no contest in 1981 to three felony counts of child molestation. He also signed a confession admitting to molesting 12 other boys ages 6 to 14 in the Conejo Valley.

For the past two years, Roemer, who remains a priest, has been undergoing court-ordered treatment at Atascadero State Hospital aimed at reorienting his sexual interest away from boys to adult males.

At last week's hearing, Atascadero officials said Roemer had made substantial progress and should be released under strict probation.

Shaw approved a plan under which Roemer will live in a secluded Woodland Hills guest house and work at a West Los Angeles religious bookstore.

While turning aside a prosecution request that Roemer be sentenced to a year in jail, Shaw imposed a suspended sentence of 8 years, 4 months. The judge said the sentence would be carried out if Roemer

should engage in further child molestation.

Shaw also ordered Roemer to pay the costs of therapy for his victims.

At an earlier pre-sentencing hearing for Roemer, parents of Conejo Valley victims testified that they had notified church officials in Thousand Oaks and Los Angeles that their sons had been molested by Roemer but that nothing was done.

One mother testified she wrote a detailed letter to the office of Cardinal Timothy Manning in Los Angeles but in reply received only a short note "saying they would pray for us."

A spokesman at the Archdiocese of Los Angeles declined comment.

Another mother told how her son was molested by Roemer while on a church-sponsored camping trip near San Bernardino. She quoted the boy as saying:

"As he (Roemer) was talking about how wonderful God was, he started moving his hands down into my pants."

Several parents testified they notified Father Colm O'Ryan, pastor at St. Paschal's,

Please see PRIEST, Page 3

SECURITY: Voluntary Tax

Continued from First Page
inwillingness in the past to pay for extra security.
The council has approved a committee recommendation that such an ordinance be drafted. There will be a public hearing before the council votes on the ordinance, Bernson said.

A spokesman for Los Angeles Police Chief Daryl F. Gates said the police department would not oppose Bernson's ordinance but would be more enthusiastic about it if city police officers were going to provide the extra security.

'May Be Only Practical Option'

"It may be the only practical option Bernson has, but it is not the most desirable one," said William Booth, the department spokesman.

Bernson said he, too, would prefer to use city police officers. But he and other local officials said they are not sure whether state law permits the selective employment of city police to patrol neighborhoods whose residents are willing to pay extra.

"It would mean that more affluent communities would be able to avail themselves of something that poorer neighborhoods couldn't afford, and that could lead to an accusation of unequal protection under the law," said James Williams, director of intergovernmental relations for the Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst.

Williams said a bill has been introduced in the Assembly that would authorize use of city police in special districts.

Even in its present form, the proposed ordinance could be subject to challenge as a prohibited method of assessment under the terms of Proposition 13.

Assessments Must Have Direct Benefit

Since Proposition 13 was approved, assessments levied by special districts must be shown to confer a direct benefit on the property of the owners being assessed.

Roberts, the assistant city attorney who is drafting the ordinance, said recently that an argument could be made that extra security in a neighborhood does not necessarily improve the value of private property in that neighborhood.

"Such a case could be made, although I think the law is on our side," Roberts said.

Robbins said he is convinced that frequent security patrols in the Tampa Bryant neighborhood would improve the value of his property.

"In my buildings, I think it would make a substantial difference in the vacancy rate. It would definitely have an economic impact," he said.

LAS VIRGI Restores 12

Continued from First Page
that the district erred in s off while skipping over t

Board members said layoff list had nothing t ruling, however.

District leaders said added to their budget th by the six-month-old L dation, an independent t up to solicit funding.

A four-night telephc staged last week raised and pledges, officials a ous foundation event t raised \$20,000, and earl \$38,000, said group spok

About 45 volunteers the State Farm Insura Westlake Village durir about 2,500 families.

Foundation director to call another 1,550 e said Johnson, who de "very encouraged" by

Pledges ranged from averaging about \$30

PRIEST: Roemer Named in Earlier Cases

Continued from First Page
of their sons' reports of molestation but that no action was taken against Roemer.

Deputy Dist. Atty. Joseph E. Taylor said that "subsequent to church officials being notified, at least 11 more boys were molested."

A spokeswoman at St. Paschal said O'Ryan was on extended leave and unavailable for comment. The pastor previously declined comment in the case.

During his three years at St. Paschal's, Roemer was widely praised for his work with children and sometimes was asked by local police to counsel troubled youths.

The Conejo Valley Parent Teacher Assn. awarded him its 1980 Honorary Service Award for his work as counselor to children and organizer of youth activities.

After Roemer's arrest in January, 1981, parents began a letter-writing campaign on his behalf, accusing police and prosecutors of being too quick to believe Roemer's youthful accusers.

At the priest's preliminary hearing, a handful of parents physically shielded Roemer from reporters. One woman screamed at a photographer seeking to take the priest's picture.

In defending Roemer, parents contended that priests who work with young boys are frequently the victims of molestation accusations.

Such support ceased within 10 days of Roemer's arrest, however, when Dist. Atty. Michael Bradbury released a confession signed by Roemer detailing the

numerous times he had molested Thousand Oaks boys. Prosecutor Taylor argued in court last week that the high degree of trust Roemer had achieved in the Conejo Valley, and his abuse of that trust, was a reason for sending him to jail for a year.

Taylor also noted that the molestation acts were premeditated and occurred "over a very long period of time."

But Bruce Mayfield, Roemer's attorney, argued that the priest had cooperated in every way with police and psychiatrists since his arrest and that "every psychiatrist and therapist who has come in contact with Father Roemer has agreed that he is coping with his psychiatric problems."

Mayfield also contended that Roemer's stay of nearly two years at Atascadero was "for all practical purposes a form of incarceration."

Taylor estimated that Roemer will have to pay therapy cost for his victims of at least \$3,000 and "probably a lot more as time goes on."



5653

COMPUTER: Charges Fly Over CompuPlus

Continued from 4th Page

Party King

25% OFF WEDDING/BAR MITZVAH INVITATIONS
LARGEST SELECTION IN THE VALLEY

135 UNIQUE & CONTEMPORARY PARTY ENSEMBLES AND DESIGNER COLORS TO CHOOSE FROM — AT DISCOUNT PRICES

GRADUATION & SUMMER FUN PARTY GOODS & DECORATIONS
20% OFF ALL-OCCASION

343-3342 343-3343 6038 BESEDA BLVD. (At Oxnard) TARZANA, CA 91354

June 13, 1983

Cardinal Timothy Manning
and
REDACTED REDACTED
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

Dear Brothers,

You who were ordained to serve our needs have done us an ill service in the case cited in the attached copy of a newspaper clipping. When I read this account in our local Star-Free Press in late May, I set about investigating as well as I could the truth of the assertions, refusing during my search an invitation to comment on the issue through the media. I assured the reporter that I was involving myself in the issue in the way I think best.

Now that I have looked into the situation, I see this as a classic example of the Good Samaritan parable: in this case a bishop, a priest and a social worker passing by looking in disgust at the victims covered with blood, dirt, vomit and seminal fluid, the three keeping their ecclesiastical garments clean and clutching protectively the communal purse. Whether any lay person, except the district attorney and a newspaper reporter came to these people's aid I have yet to learn.

I am ashamed of the actions of my bishop and of Catholic Social Services in this case (and I recall now the recent child abuse case by a nun in the diocese, where the family had to resort to the courts after being refused help through the chancery office.) I have reviewed my own life and brought to recollection my own sins of fear, insensitivity, hypocrisy and idolatry, so I can say to you lovingly, "Dear Brothers" and ask God to complete the work of forgiveness in me.

One of the tasks I need to do to see that this does not happen again in the Catholic community is to confront you with my thoughts and feelings. I am grateful that St. James advises us to do this privately at least in the first instance. Due to a mild Parkinson's disease, I cannot drive to Los Angeles for appointments with you, so I must use the mail. My accomodating agnostic husband (I am a convert to the church after my marriage) would probably drive me to the city, but I chose not to ask him to do so, since he ^{thinks} it quixotic to attempt to have any influence on the bureaucracy of the church.

I have been given to understand that Fr. Roemer has had some support from the clergy and I pray that you will stand by him in the difficult days ahead. I am told that Fr. or REDACTED REDACTED has had even more fraternal help in his burn out experience, and I hope you will act wisely in his regard. But where is any concern by the clergy for the victims of Fr. Roemer's disorder and for their understandably angry and confused parents?

- 2 -

Please do not ask your secretaries to reply to this letter. It is addressed to you personally and I prefer no acknowledgement of it to one by an aide, and please do not tell me about the legal dangers of involving the church in this issue. I have been long married to REDACTED and know about law suits and lawyers' games, but I also know about integrity and something about the creative power and readiness of the Holy Spirit to help us find ways to behave as Christians. I beg you to find a way to help these justifiably angry and confused parents whom you have injured by your rejection, and I ask you to apologize to the community whom you have offended by acting as you have in your official capacities in this case.

May Almighty God have mercy on us, forgive us our sins and bring us to everlasting life.

Sincerely,
REDACTED

St. Anthony of Padua, pray for us

5642

CCI 002890

Ventura County
Star☆Free Press

5250 RALSTON STREET, P.O. BOX 6711, VENTURA, CALIFORNIA 93006. TELEPHONE (805) 656-4111

June 22, 1983

Cardinal Timothy Manning
 The Chancellery Office
 1531 W. Ninth Street
 Los Angeles, Ca. 90015

Dear Cardinal Manning:

A particularly sensitive issue was raised recently in a Ventura County court case dealing with a Catholic priest. It begs for a response from the Archdiocese and we would hope an interview with you might be possible.

During a hearing before Ventura County Superior Court Judge Robert Shaw on Thursday, May 26, the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer was sentenced for the crime of child molestation. He was placed on a program of supervised probation.

Just before the sentencing, five parents of children who were victims of Roemer testified about how these young boys have dealt with problems stemming from the crimes. A common theme dominating this testimony was a disillusionment and disappointment with the Catholic Church for its purported failure to offer these families any assistance in the two years since the crimes occurred. Said REDACTED, whose 14-year-old son REDACTED had been molested by Roemer: "We thought the church would step forward and say, 'Hey, what can we do to help?' But they haven't done a damn thing."

During another portion of the hearing, Ventura County Deputy District Attorney Joe Taylor asked REDACTED, whose son REDACTED was another victim: "Did you look to the church...for support, help and assistance?" She replied: "I did. I called Catholic Social Services and told them. And they said they couldn't get involved. In fact, I wrote a very long appealing letter to Cardinal Manning, and I got a brief note back from his secretary saying they would pray for us.... I was heartbroken."

The testimony during the hearing was the subject of a front-page story in the Star-Free Press on May 26. After the hearing, Mrs. REDACTED and Mr. and Mrs. REDACTED of Thousand Oaks, the parents of two other boys, REDACTED and REDACTED who were victimized by Roemer, visited the offices of the Star-Free Press to expand on their frustrations with the church. We have not publicized these further allegations and will not without first giving the church a chance to respond.

Since the publication of the May 26 article on the Rev. Roemer's sentencing, we have received feedback from Catholics in Ventura County who have expressed surprise and disbelief that the church has reportedly done nothing for these parents or their children.

We would like to set the record straight. Has the parish or Archdiocese

5635

Cardinal Timothy Manning

-2-

June 22, 1983

considered action to assist the victims of these unfortunate crimes? Is Mrs. REDACTED statement correct that she failed to receive a full reply to her appeal for assistance?

We believe that a full and fair airing of the story is important to allay concerns raised by the courtroom statements of these distraught parents. We respectfully request that you grant an interview with a reporter from the Star-Free Press, at your convenience.

If you wish to arrange an interview, please contact City Editor Timm Herdt at (805) 656-4111.

Respectfully,



Stan Whisenhunt
Managing Editor

SW:rm

5636

CCI 002892

Ventura County
Star☆Free Press

5250 RALSTON STREET, P.O. BOX 6711, VENTURA, CALIFORNIA 93006, TELEPHONE (805) 656-4111

June 22, 1983

Cardinal Timothy Manning
 The Chancellery Office
 1531 W. Ninth Street
 Los Angeles, Ca. 90015

Dear Cardinal Manning:

A particularly sensitive issue was raised recently in a Ventura County court case dealing with a Catholic priest. It begs for a response from the Archdiocese and we would hope an interview with you might be possible.

During a hearing before Ventura County Superior Court Judge Robert Shaw on Thursday, May 26, the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer was sentenced for the crime of child molestation. He was placed on a program of supervised probation.

Just before the sentencing, five parents of children who were victims of Roemer testified about how these young boys have dealt with problems stemming from the crimes. A common theme dominating this testimony was a disillusionment and disappointment with the Catholic Church for its purported failure to offer these families any assistance in the two years since the crimes occurred. Said REDACTED whose 14-year-old son REDACTED had been molested by Roemer: "We thought the church would step forward and say, 'Hey, what can we do to help?' But they haven't done a damn thing."

During another portion of the hearing, Ventura County Deputy District Attorney Joe Taylor asked REDACTED whose son REDACTED was another victim: "Did you look to the church...for support, help and assistance?" She replied: "I did. I called Catholic Social Services and told them. And they said they couldn't get involved. In fact, I wrote a very long appealing letter to Cardinal Manning, and I got a brief note back from his secretary saying they would pray for us.... I was heartbroken."

The testimony during the hearing was the subject of a front-page story in the Star-Free Press on May 26. After the hearing, Mrs. REDACTED and Mr. and Mrs. REDACTED of Thousand Oaks, the parents of two other boys, REDACTED who were victimized by Roemer, visited the offices of the Star-Free Press to expand on their frustrations with the church. We have not publicized these further allegations and will not without first giving the church a chance to respond.

Since the publication of the May 26 article on the Rev. Roemer's sentencing, we have received feedback from Catholics in Ventura County who have expressed surprise and disbelief that the church has reportedly done nothing for these parents or their children.

We would like to set the record straight. Has the parish or Archdiocese

Cardinal Timothy Manning

-2-

June 22, 1983

considered action to assist the victims of these unfortunate crimes? Is Mrs.
REDACTED statement correct that she failed to receive a full reply to her
appeal for assistance?

We believe that a full and fair airing of the story is important to allay
concerns raised by the courtroom statements of these distraught parents. We
respectfully request that you grant an interview with a reporter from the
Star-Free Press, at your convenience.

If you wish to arrange an interview, please contact City Editor Timm Herdt
at (805) 656-4111.

Respectfully,



Stan Whisenhunt
Managing Editor

SW:rm

5624

REDACTED

(Bene & Capin)
for his information
than give to
Ray ✓

REDACTED

to

5634

REDACTED

*File
Patrick Roemer*

June 27, 1983

Ventura County Star Free Press
5250 Ralston Street
P.O. Box 6711
Ventura, CA. 93006

Attention: Mr. Stan Whisenhunt, Managing Editor

Dear Mr. Whisenhunt:

Cardinal Manning has referred to me for reply your letter to him of June 22, 1983. As you may remember I represented Father Patrick Roemer in the matter before Ventura County counsel was engaged. There are some facts which I think you should be aware of and which I think will answer the inquiries contained in your letter: (1) Father REDACTED the co-administrator of Father Roemer's parish contacted the parents of every child involved and expressed his sympathy and willingness of the church to be of assistance (2) Early in the case before any of the arraignment proceedings were conducted, at the instructions of the Chancery Office, I contacted as many of the parents as would speak with me. Some refused because the District Attorney requested them not to discuss the matter with me. This is no criticism of the District Attorney. He was simply fulfilling his responsibilities as the prosecutor in the case and his refusal is understood. However, among those I talked with was the lady who testified in court that when she requested help from the Archdiocese she was told by letter that they would pray for her. I talked with this lady about April 2, 1981 before her request and she advised me that she had medical expenses that were close to \$500.00 and that she would like to have help from the church. I passed this on to His Eminence Cardinal Manning. He had a check for \$500.00 sent to her and the letter of transmittal said in part "we are attaching a check for \$500.00. This hopefully will assist you in paying for your maternity costs. The genuine concern for the Church, its ministers and its people is deeply appreciated. We shall indeed keep a prayerfull remembrance for you."

I ask you, does this put a different face on the story as you had it heretofore? And you note she was asking for personal medical help - nothing for her son!

5628

To Mr. Stan Whisenhunt
of Ventura County Star Free Press
June 27, 1983
Page 2

Furthermore, I have been discussing with Father Roemer's probation officer the matter of psychiatric expenses that Judge Shaw has ordered Father Roemer to pay. Although this is basically Father Roemer's responsibility he is without funds and I have arranged for Father to cover his responsibilities under the court order.

For your information as far as I know there has been no effort by parents to contact the Church concerning this matter except as indicated in your letter. The efforts in this area were those of Father REDACTED and myself at the direction of the Chancery Office mentioned above. His Eminence nor any of the Chancery officials, to my knowledge, have any additional information. Please call me if I can be of further assistance.

Very truly yours,
REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

*What was the amount paid?**\$3,280* REDACTED*Will it be on my file?*

REDACTED

yes

June 28, 1983

Corrections Services Agency
 Collections Unit
 Hall of Justice
 Room 205
 800 South Victoria Avenue
 Ventura, CA 93009

Attention: REDACTED

Re: Donald Roemer - Case #CR 16350

Dear REDACTED

This is to cover all of Father Roemer's financial obligations to date of the Judge's Order.

Very truly yours,

REDACTED

REDACTED
REDACTED

Enclosure

bcc: Monsignor Benjamin G. Hawkes

5625

REDACTED

June 28, 1983

Ventura County Star Free Press
5250 Ralston Street
P.O. Box 6711
Ventura, CA 93006

Attention: Mr. Stan Whisenhunt, Managing Editor

Dear Mr. Whisenhunt:

Cardinal Manning has referred to me for reply your letter to him of June 22, 1983. As you may remember, I represented Father Patrick Roemer in the matter before Ventura County counsel was engaged. There are some facts which I think you should be aware of and which I think will answer the inquiries contained in your letter: (1) Father REDACTED the co-administrator of Father Roemer's parish, contacted the parents of every child involved and expressed his sympathy and willingness of the church to be of assistance; (2) Early in the case before any of the arraignment proceedings were conducted, at the instructions of the Chancery Office, I contacted as many of the parents as would speak with me. Some refused because the District Attorney requested them not to discuss the matter with me. This is no criticism of the District Attorney. He was simply fulfilling his responsibilities as the prosecutor in the case and his refusal is understood. However, among those I talked with was the lady who testified in court that, when she requested help from the Archdiocese, she was told by letter that they would pray for her. I talked with this lady about April 2, 1981, before her request, and she advised me that she had medical expenses that were close to \$500.00 and that she would like to have help from the church. I passed this on to His Eminence Cardinal Manning. He had a check for \$500.00 sent to her and the letter of transmittal said in part "we are attaching a check for \$500.00. This hopefully will assist you in paying for your maternity costs. The genuine concern for the Church, its ministers and its people is deeply appreciated. We shall indeed keep a prayerfull remembrance for you."

I ask you, does this put a different face on the story as you had it heretofore? And you note she was asking for personal medical help - nothing for her son!

5621

To Mr. Stan Whisenhunt
of Ventura County Star Free Press
June 28, 1983
Page 2

Furthermore, I have been discussing with Father Roemer's probation officer the matter of psychiatric expenses that Judge Shaw has ordered Father Roemer to pay. Although this is basically Father Roemer's responsibility he is without funds and I have arranged for Father to cover his responsibilities under the court order.

For your information, as far as I know, there has been no effort by parents to contact the Church concerning this matter except as indicated in your letter. The efforts in this area were those of Father REDACTED and myself at the direction of the Chancery Office mentioned above. Neither His Eminence nor any of the Chancery Officials, to my knowledge, have any additional information. Please call me if I can be of further assistance.

Yours very truly,
REDACTED

JJB:krs

bcc: Rev. Monsignor Benjamin G. Hawkes

1259

CATHOLIC SENTINEL

-8-19-83

Archdiocese Outlines Sex Abuse Reporting Responsibilities

Archdiocese Outlines Sex Abuse Reporting Responsibilities
See page 10

Top officials of the Portland Archdiocese are taking immediate steps to ensure that any allegations of abuse of children, including sexual abuse, are reported immediately to civil authorities.

Some of the actions already being planned by the Archdiocese, but their imple-

mentation is now being accelerated.

Other steps were recommended to the Archdiocesan officials by a special citizen's committee headed by Hardy Myers, a Democratic state representative and parishioner at All Saints Parish, Portland, where some abuse cases have occurred. Other

committee members include Barbara Mahoney, professor of history at Willamette University, Salem; Pat McCormick, Salem lobbyist and member of the advisory committee of the Oregon Catholic Conference, and Dave Myers, Portland psychologist with particular expertise with sexual abuse cases.

The steps call for the existing Priests' Health Panel to include qualified people who can deal with priests who have psychological, personality or emotional problems as well as alcohol and drug dependency problems. A memo will be written to all the priests explaining their obligation

Pope's Lourdes Visit Honors Virgin Mary
See page 10

National Catholic News Service
 LOURDES, France — Pope John Paul's 30-hour visit this past weekend to the Marian shrine here marked another step in his continuing devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary—and to pay honor on her 2,000 birthday.

The Church has no official date for the birth of Mary, but the Pope

See LOURDES, Page 20

and directed him to seek professional counseling.

In a follow-up of the case, the archbishop said he was assured that the matter was receiving proper attention and that there was no likelihood that such a thing would occur again.

The archbishop noted that when people have complaints against a priest "on whatever grounds," they can inform him in confidence of their grievance. The archbishop then will contact the priest and if the archbishop finds substance to the charge, he assists the priest to work out the problem.

In most instances the situation is corrected or otherwise resolved, the archbishop noted.

"But in the case of Father Laughlin, the problem was more deep-seated than anyone suspected," he said. "It is something of deep regret to all of us."

District Attorney Schnunk said cases like this are not unique to the clergy. "We go through this with doctors and lawyers, too."

Wilson of Child Protective Services said that sex abuse of children is the fastest growing crime sector, with 120 new investigations opened by his office each month.

He participated in the two month investigation of Father Laughlin, generated by a victim

adoption.

They are Fathers John Brouillard, Donald Buxman, Wayne Forbes, Theodore Frison, Emmett Harrington, Charles Lienert, C.J. Linehan, J.J. Linehan, Joseph S. McMahon, Neil Moore, Richard Paperini, Paul Petri, John Waldron, Joseph Wood and David Zegar.

Archdiocesan officials have been conferring with Michael Schnunk, Multnomah County district attorney, on the provisions of the reporting law to clarify the reporting obligation of clergy members and other professional people.

Archbishop Cornelius Power said what makes the matter of reporting so difficult for clergymen when they are informed of child abuse is that the law itself specifically exempts them as well as psychiatrists, psychologists and attorneys from reporting "information communicated by a person if the communication is privileged."

"The problem is that clergymen, like others, are often dealing in the nature of their work in confidential matters, and in a situation of trust in their relationships with people," he said. "Determining when communication is privileged and when it is not involves delicate distinctions and will cause honest people to differ."

The question of privileged communication with respect to the reporting of child abuse is presently under study by a committee made up of representatives of the archdiocese, the district attorney's office and the state Children's Services Division. "We're not looking for loopholes in this regard," said Archbishop Power, "we want to protect the children and their families while safeguarding the confidentiality necessary for priests in their pastoral work."

Clarification of the law has held up distribution of the letter to the priests, Auxiliary Bishop Paul Waldschmidt added.

Father Thomas Laughlin pleaded guilty last June to two misdemeanor charges of sexual abuse of minor boys in 1980. The priest, 57, formerly of All Saints Parish, Portland, was scheduled to be reassigned Aug. 1 to St. Thomas More Parish in southwest Portland, as part of a transfer of pastors who have been in their same parishes for 10 years or more.

He resigned from All Saints Parish and later pleaded guilty to the charges in Multnomah County Circuit Court. His assignment to St. Thomas More was withdrawn.

Under the terms of the

recommended that he be placed on probation on condition that he complete an in-patient, state-run program for sex offenders that includes diversion therapy and/or group therapy, and that he have no contact with children under the age of 18 during the five year probationary period. He also was to pay the costs of any counseling required by the victims. Sentencing is Aug. 30.

The question of the Archdiocese's reporting responsibility in the case was raised by Bart Wilson, manager of the State Child Protective Services Branch in East Portland. He said state law requires mandatory reports and investigations of abuse of children to prevent their further abuse and to safeguard them.

"Any public or private official having reasonable cause to believe that any child with whom the official comes in contact with in any capacity has suffered abuse... shall report to the state Children's Services Division or a law enforcement agency," the law says. Failure to report any form of child abuse is a violation, the Multnomah County district attorney's office said.

Archbishop Power said he called Father Laughlin in immediately after a victim and his family came forward in 1981. The archbishop said he confronted

to report instances of child abuse. The memo will include a copy of the state law governing reporting responsibilities. Principals of the Archdiocese's 50 elementary schools and nine high schools also will be sent a booklet on child abuse. Parents of the more than 13,000 Catholic school students will receive the same booklet. The Archdiocesan Office of Total Education will conduct a special program for staff, faculty and parents at All Saints School and Central City High School, where abuse cases occurred. Special instruction on child abuse and the requirement to report instances of it will be included in teacher in-service training sessions.

The actions come in the wake of the prosecution in June of a Portland priest who pleaded guilty to two misdemeanor counts of sexual abuse of children.

Separately, 15 Portland-area priests met earlier this month and agreed that the archdiocesan clergy would be well served by the development of a professional code of ethics and a procedure for evaluating alleged violations of professional behavior. They committed themselves to a year-long study of the idea in hopes of presenting a proposal to next year's clergy convention for



SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
RENEWAL COMMUNITIES
BOOK & TAPE MINISTRY
REDACTED

SCRC

Sept 22

Dear Cardinal Manning

I surely hope and pray that you are well! I thought I'd share a little, and let you know (as we sometimes say!) "where I am at."

I'm still involved Monday and Thursday evenings in therapy in Sherman Oaks. That experience is really helpful, I've discovered. About 4 weeks ago, I "re-visited" Atascadero - this time, however, I could "walk out." That was a good "letting go." Sometimes this stuff needs to know and feel that some of their efforts are helpful (Don't we all need to know that!?)

I am living in a nice, old, "fixed up" guest home in Woodland Hills. I enjoy the freedom to take care of

Serving Catholic Renewal in Southern California

my needs, and over the pot.
 That is a little routine, i.e., -
 doing my own laundry and gardening
 and cooking. Gardening is a
 hobby, so I am content to fix the
 old place up a little. I've signed
 up for some adult education courses
 at a local community college, also.

Father ^{REDACTED} has become a
 friend and very valuable spiritual
 director, I see him regularly. I
use this as a part of my overall
 process of "discernment."

I've enclosed a copy of
 the article I recently wrote. I
 do accept + understand the reasons
 why I cannot have "public visibility."
 But I did want to personally share
 what I wrote with you.

I pray all the best for
 you. May all you do be blessed.

sincerely + gratefully in the heart,

Pat Roemer

MEMORANDUM

FROM: MONSIGNOR RAWDEN
TO: MONSIGNOR HAWKES
RE: FATHER PATRICK ROEMER
DATE: 15NOVEMBER 1983

Monsignor Hawkes:

I have searched the file of Father Pat Roemer, and find no indication of even a suspicion of wrong-doing before 27 January 1981. This was the date of his arrest, which was reported to me by Father REDACTED .

There was a newspaper article which claimed that a parent came to Father REDACTED sometime before this date and that the matter was investigated by the Sheriff's Department and then dropped. There are some implications in the newspaper article that this was a cover-up on the part of Father REDACTED and the REDACTED at St. Paschal Baylon, who happens to be a member of the Sheriff Department.

Both REDACTED REDACTED and Father REDACTED have assured me that previous to 27 January 1981 no report was ever made to the Chancery Office by Father REDACTED regarding the condition of Father Roemer. Likewise, Father REDACTED and Father REDACTED are both of the opinion that Father REDACTED did not report this matter to the Chancery Office before 27 January 1981. Father REDACTED added that he was sure that Father REDACTED had mentioned none of this to anyone before 27 January 1981.

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

November 29, 1983

REDACTED
REDACTED

Re: REDACTED

v. RCA, et al.

v. RCA, et al.

v. RCA, et al.

nor v. RCA, et al.

. RCA, et al.

or Court Case Nos.

Dear Mr. REDACTED

We have been retained by The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles in the above captioned matters which, I understand from plaintiffs' attorneys, have now been filed and are out for service.

REDACTED

5603

REDACTED

Re: REDACTED et al. v, RCA (Fr. Roemer)

Page 2

REDACTED

REDACTED

Father ^{REDACTED} - St. Paschal - will be on the lookout for summons and complaint, and will advise Chancery as soon as it may come in.

He has been sending mail for Father ^{REDACTED} to him at ^{REDACTED}, Ireland.

Father ^{REDACTED} has a ^{REDACTED}, ^{REDACTED}, at the above address.

^{REDACTED}

^{REDACTED} - *wrote & tell*

12/2/83

his brother a summons may come & please return to me

^{REDACTED}

5607

REDACTED

FILED

FEB 23 1984

RICHARD D. DEAN, County Clerk

By
Deputy County Clerk

1
2 340 Rosewood Avenue, Suite "O"
3 Camarillo, California 93010
4 Telephone: (805) 484-0514
5
6
7
8
9 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF VENTURA

10 REDACTED

11)
12)
13)
14)
15)
16)
17)

Case No. **82750**

18 Plaintiffs)
19 VS.)
20 ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP)
21 OF LOS ANGELES, a California)
22 Corporation; ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS)
23 ANGELES, EDUCATION AND WELFARE)
24 CORPORATION, a California)
25 Corporation; PATRICK ROEMER;)
26 FATHER COLM O'RYAN; ST. PASCHAL)
27 BAYLON CATHOLIC CHURCH; an)
28 unincorporated association; and)
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive.)
Defendants.)

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
(Breach of Contract,
Assault and Battery,
Intentional Infliction
of Emotional Distress,
Negligent Infliction of
Emotional Distress,
Negligence, Punitive
Damages)

6156

Plaintiffs complain of Defendants, and each of them
and allege:

REDACTED

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

1. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise, of Defendants DOES I through 50, inclusive, and each of them, are unknown to Plaintiffs, who therefore sue said Defendants by such fictitious names and will seek leave of court to amend this complaint to show their true names and capacities when the same are ascertained. Said Defendants are sued as principals or agents, servants and employees of said principals and all of the acts performed by them were performed within the course and scope of their authority and employment.

2. At all times herein mentioned, each of the Defendants was the agent and employee of each of the remaining Defendants, and was acting within the purpose and scope of said agency and employment.

3. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES (hereinafter "ARCHBISHOP") was and is a California corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California and authorized to transact and transacting business in the State of California, with its principal place of business in the County of Los Angeles.

4. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES, EDUCATION AND WELFARE CORPORATION (hereinafter "ARCHDIOCESE"), was and is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California and authorized to transact and transacting business in the State of California, with its principal place of business in the County of Los Angeles.

REDACTED^{2A}

1 5. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon
2 allege that at all times herein mentioned, Defendant ST. PASCHAL
3 BAYLON CATHOLIC CHURCH (hereinafter "ST. PASCHAL's") was and is
4 an incorporated association sued herein under the name by which
5 it is known, doing business as a church with its principal
6 office in the City of Thousand Oaks, County of Ventura, State of
7 California.

8 6. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant PATRICK
9 ROEMER (hereinafter "ROEMER") was a priest of the Roman Catholic
10 Church employed by Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST.
11 PASCHAL'S, and each of them, and in doing the acts herein
12 alleged was acting in the course and scope of said employment.

13 7. At all times herein mentioned, FATHER COLM O'RYAN
14 (hereinafter "O'RYAN") was a priest of the Roman Catholic Church
15 employed by Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST.
16 PASCHAL's, and each of them, in a managerial capacity, and in
17 doing the acts herein alleged was acting in the course and scope
18 of said employment and in his managerial capacity.

19 8. Prior to the incident alleged hereinafter,
20 Defendant ROEMER informed various counselors and psychologists
21 employed by the Catholic Church of Defendant ROEMER's tendencies
22 toward pedophilia, his prior sexual molestations of minor
23 children, some of which were performed during the course and
24 scope of Defendant ROEMER's employment by Defendants ARCHBISHOP,
25 ARCHDIOCESE, and ST. PASCHAL's. Plaintiffs are informed and
26 believe and thereon allege that said counselors, psychologists
27 and other persons knew or should have known that Defendant
REDACTED ROEMER would repeat these acts on minors with whom he would

1 come in contact during the course and scope of his employment.
2 Said psychologists, counselors and other persons are named
3 herein as Defendants DOES I through 20. When Plaintiffs
4 ascertain the true names of said Defendants, Plaintiffs will
5 seek leave to amend this complaint to add said names.

6 9. On or about December 27, 1980, a parishoner parent
7 of a minor who had been sexually molested by Defendant ROEMER
8 informed Defendant O'RYAN that her son had been severely
9 sexually molested by Defendant ROEMER and that such act was
10 committed during the course and scope of ROEMER's employment.
11 Defendant O'RYAN assured said parent that the matter would be
12 investigated and remedied. Thereafter, having been notified of
13 Defendant ROEMER's molestation of a minor, Defendants
14 ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN, and ST. PASCHAL's continued to
15 employ Defendant ROEMER as a priest, and failed to take any
16 precautions to insure the safety of minor children coming into
17 contact with Defendant ROEMER. Moreover, said Defendants
18 continued to employ Defendant ROEMER in a position at ST.
19 PASCHAL's, placing him in charge of children's services and
20 encouraging him to use his position of authority as priest and
21 teacher to lead the children of ST. PASCHAL's parishioners in
22 their religious learning at all times herein mentioned.

23 /

24 /

25 /

26 /

27 /

28 /

REDACTED

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED

A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN

AD LITEM, REDACTED

AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

(Assault and Battery, Punitive Damages)

10. Plaintiff REDACTED is a minor ~~thirteen (13)~~ ^{ten (10)} years of age. On 2.23.84, REDACTED Plaintiff's mother, a competent and responsible adult, was appointed by Order duly given and made by the above-entitled court, and is now the duly qualified and acting guardian ad litem of the minor Plaintiff in this action.

11. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 9 of this Complaint as though fully set forth.

12. On or about January 26, 1981, Plaintiff was at Defendant ST. PASCHAL's for Catholic Christian classes. Defendant ROEMER came outside of his office and asked Plaintiff to come inside and look at some pictures. Defendant ROEMER then assaulted and battered Plaintiff by lifting Plaintiff up and placing Plaintiff on Defendant's leg. Defendant showed Plaintiff some pictures and put his hand under Plaintiff's shirt and rubbed Plaintiff's stomach. Defendant ROEMER then slid his hand down Plaintiff's pants and inside Plaintiff's underpants and rubbed Plaintiff's penis for several minutes. Defendant also kissed Plaintiff on the neck, near the ear, as he was rubbing Plaintiff.

REDACTED /

6160

1 13. Each of the aforementioned acts was offensive to
2 Plaintiff, and by reason of the acts of Defendant ROEMER,
3 Plaintiff was caused to suffer great mental, physical, nervous
4 and emotional pain and suffering. As a result of Plaintiff's
5 injuries, Plaintiff suffered general damages in excess of the
6 jurisdictional minimum of this Court.

7 14. As a further direct and proximate result of the
8 acts of Defendant ROEMER, acting in the course and scope of his
9 employment by Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST.
10 PASCHAL's, and each of them, Plaintiff has incurred, and in the
11 future will incur further expenses for the services of
12 physicians, nurses, and other medical and health care personnel
13 for medical and incidental treatment. The exact amount of such
14 expenses is unknown to Plaintiff at this time. Leave to amend
15 this Complaint to set forth said sums will be sought when the
16 same have been ascertained.

17 15. In making the uninvited and unprovoked attack on
18 Plaintiff as heretofore alleged, Defendant ROEMER acted
19 maliciously and was guilty of wanton and conscious disregard of
20 the rights and feelings of Plaintiff, and by reason thereof
21 Plaintiff demands exemplary and punitive damages against
22 Defendants ROEMER, ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST. PASCHAL's in
23 an amount according to proof.

24 /

25 /

26 /

27 /

28 /

REDACTED

REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM

REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

(Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress,
Punitive Damages)

16. Plaintiff REDACTED realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations contained in his First Cause of Action, as if set forth fully herein.

17. Defendant ROEMER's conduct was intentional and malicious and done for the purpose of causing Plaintiff to suffer humiliation, mental anguish, and emotional and physical distress, and as a proximate result thereof has been required to and will continue to receive the aid, treatment, counseling and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and physicians, the services of which have caused him to suffer monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

18. As a direct and proximate result of the intentional, malicious, extreme and outrageous acts of the Defendants, and each of them, as herein above alleged, Plaintiff has suffered severe and permanent emotional distress, all to his general damage in a sum within the jurisdiction of this court.

19. The conduct of the Defendants, and each of them, in doing the acts herein above alleged was malicious and oppressive and Defendants were guilty of wanton disregard of the rights and feelings of Plaintiff and by reason thereof, Plaintiff demands exemplary and punitive damages against Defendants in an amount according to proof.

REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM
REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS
(Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress)

20. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by this reference each and every allegation contained his First, and Second Causes of Action, as if set forth fully herein.

21. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, owed a duty of care to Plaintiff to exercise reasonable care toward Plaintiff while Plaintiff was on the premises of ST. PASCHAL's and to insure his safety at the church-sponsored above-described Catholic education classes. Defendants, and each of them, breached said duty as previously alleged herein by failing to prevent Defendant ROEMER from performing the acts previously alleged and by failing to provide for the Plaintiff's safety.

22. As a direct and proximate result of the negligent conduct by Defendants, and each of them, as herein alleged, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer severe and permanent mental and emotional distress and as a proximate result thereof, has been required to and will continue to receive the aid, treatment, counseling, and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists, and physicians, the services of which have caused him to suffer monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

1 23. As a direct and proximate result of the
2 negligence of Defendants, and each of them, as above alleged,
3 Plaintiff has suffered severe and permanent emotional distress
4 all to his general damage in a sum within the jurisdictional
5 minimum of this court.

6 /

7 /

8 /

9 /

10 /

11 /

12 /

13 /

14 /

15 /

16 /

17 /

18 /

19 /

20 /

21 /

22 /

23 /

24 /

25 /

26 /

27 /

/

6164

REDACTED

REDACTED

24. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by this reference, each and every allegation contained his First, Second, and Third Causes of Action, as if set forth fully herein

26. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant ROEMER was in charge of children's services at ST. PASHAL's. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that in said capacity, Defendant ROEMER was encouraged by said Defendants to, and did frequently, come in contact with minor children.

27. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that prior to placing Defendant ROEMER in said position of employment and after said Defendants were notified of Defendant ROEMER'S sexual molestation of a parishoner's son as alleged above, Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN and ST. PASCHAL's knew or should have known that Defendant ROEMER had molested and would continue to molest minors with whom he came in contact.

CCI 002921

1 28. In spite of said knowledge, Defendants ARCHBISHOP,
2 ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN and ST. PASCHAL's continued to employ
3 Defendant ROEMER in said capacity, and failed to warn minors or
4 their parents or guardians of Defendant ROEMER's conduct.

5 29. As a proximate result of said Defendants' failure
6 to warn and failure to exercise reasonable care as above
7 alleged, Plaintiff came into contact with Defendant ROEMER in
8 the course of ST. PASCHAL'S youth activities program and
9 suffered the injuries as above alleged, which injuries Defen-
10 dants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN and ST. PASCHAL's knew, or
11 should have known, would occur.

12 30. As a direct and proximate result of said failure
13 to warn, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer mental
14 and emotional distress and as a proximate result thereof has
15 been required to and will continue to receive the aid, treat-
16 ment, counseling and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists
17 and physicians, the services of which have caused him to suffer
18 monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will
19 be shown by an amendment to this complaint or according to proof

20 31. As a direct and proximate result of said failure
21 to warn by Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered
22 severe and permanent emotional distress, all to his general
23 damage in a sum within the jurisdiction of this court.

24 32. The conduct of Defendants, and each of them, as
25 hereinabove alleged, in failing to warn Plaintiff; in failing to
26 exercise reasonable care towards Plaintiff and in continuing to
27 employ Defendant ROEMER in a position where he was in contact
28 with children was in conscious disregard of the rights of
Plaintiff and thereby entitles Plaintiff to punitive and

REDACTED

6166

1 exemplary damages in a sum to be shown at trial.

2
3 FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

4 REDACTED

A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN

5 AD LITEM, REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

6 (Assault and Battery, Punitive Damages)

7 33. Plaintiff REDACTED is a minor thirteen
8 (13) years of age. On 2-23-84, REDACTED Plaintiff's
9 mother, a competent and responsible adult, was appointed by
10 order duly given and made by the above-entitled court, and is
11 now the duly qualified and acting guardian ad litem of the minor
12 Plaintiff in this action.

13 34. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by
14 reference each and every allegation contained in the paragraphs
15 1 through 9 of this Complaint as though fully set forth.

16 35. On or about January 19, 1981, while Defendant
17 ROEMER was hearing Plaintiff's confession at Defendant ST.
18 PASCHAL'S, Defendant ROEMER assaulted and battered Plaintiff by
19 rubbing his stomach, chest, and underarm area, touching skin
20 under his shirt, while Defendant and Plaintiff were sitting side
21 by side in chairs. During the confession, Defendant also
22 assaulted and battered Plaintiff by kissing him repeatedly on
23 the right ear.

24 36. Each of the aforementioned acts was offensive to
25 Plaintiff, and by reason of the acts of Defendant ROEMER,
26 Plaintiff was caused to suffer great mental, physical, nervous
27 and emotional pain and suffering. As a result of Plaintiff's
28 injuries, Plaintiff suffered general damages in excess of the
REDACTED jurisdictional minimum of this Court.

6167

1 37. As a further direct and proximate result of the
 2 acts of Defendant ROEMER, acting in the course and scope of his
 3 employment by Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST.
 4 PASCHAL's, and each of them, Plaintiff has incurred and in the
 5 future will incur expenses for the services of physicians,
 6 nurses and other medical and health care personnel for medical
 7 and incidental treatment. The exact amount of such expenses if
 8 unknown to Plaintiff at this time. Leave to amend this
 9 complaint to set forth said sums will be sought when the same
 10 have been ascertained.

11 38. In making the uninvited and unprovoked attack on
 12 Plaintiff as heretofore alleged, Defendant ROEMER acted
 13 maliciously and was guilty of wanton and conscious disregard of
 14 the rights and feelings of Plaintiff, and by reason thereof
 15 Plaintiff demands exemplary and punitive damages against
 16 Defendants ROEMER, ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST. PASCHAL's in
 17 an amount according to proof.

18
 19 SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION
 20

21 REDACTED

A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD

22 LITEM, REDACTED

AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

23 (Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress,

24 Punitive Damages)
 25

26 39. Plaintiff REDACTED realleges and
 27 incorporates by reference all allegations contained in the
 28 REDACTED Fifth Cause of action herein as if set forth fully.

1 40. Defendant ROEMER's conduct was intentional and
2 malicious and done for the purpose of causing Plaintiff to
3 suffer humiliation, mental anguish, and emotional and physical
4 distress, and as a proximate result thereof Plaintiff has been
5 and will be required to receive the aid, treatment, counseling
6 and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and physicians,
7 the services of which will cause him to suffer monetary damage
8 in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an
9 amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

10
11 41. As a direct and proximate result of the
12 intentional, malicious, extreme and outrageous acts of the
13 Defendants, and each of them, as herein above alleged, Plaintiff
14 has suffered severe and permanent emotional distress, all to his
15 general damage in a sum within the jurisdiction of this court.

16
17 42. The conduct of the Defendants, and each of them,
18 in doing the acts herein above alleged was malicious and
19 oppressive and Defendants were guilty of wanton disregard of the
20 rights and feelings of Plaintiff and by reason thereof,
21 Plaintiff demands exemplary and punitive damages against
22 Defendants in an amount according to proof.

/

/

/

/

/

/

6169

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED

A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH

HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM, REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

(Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress)

43. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation contained in his Fifth and Sixth Causes of Action as if set forth fully herein.

44. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, owed a duty of due care to Plaintiff to exercise reasonable care towards Plaintiff while Plaintiff was on the premises of Defendant ST. PASCHAL's and while Plaintiff was participating in confession. Defendants, and each of them, breached said duty by failing to prevent Defendant ROEMER from performing the acts previously alleged and by failing to provide for the Plaintiff's safety.

45. As a direct and proximate result of the negligent conduct by Defendants, and each of them, as herein alleged, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer severe and permanent mental and emotional distress and as a proximate result thereof, has been required and will continue to receive the aid, treatment, counseling, and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists, and physicians, the services of which will cause him to suffer monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

46. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence of Defendants, and each of them, as above alleged, Plaintiff has suffered severe and permanent emotional distress all to his general damage in a sum within the jurisdictional minimum of this court.

REDACTED

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED

A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN

AD LITEM, REDACTED

AGAINST DEFENDANTS ROMAN CATHOLIC

ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES, ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES

EDUCATION AND WELFARE CORPORATION, FATHER REDACTED

AND ST. PASCHAL'S

(Negligent Employment, Punitive Damages)

47. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by this reference all the allegations contained in his Fifth, Sixth Seventh and Eighth Causes of Action.

48. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants O'RYAN, ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, ST. PASCHAL'S, and DOES 21 through 30 were responsible in some manner for hiring, employing, and placing Defendant ROEMER in his position as an employed priest at ST. PASCHAL's.

49. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant ROEMER was in charge of children's services at ST. PASCHAL's. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that in said capacity, Defendant ROEMER was encouraged by said Defendants to, and did frequently, come in contact with minor children.

50. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that prior to placing Defendant ROEMER in said position of employment, and after said Defendants were notified of Defendant ROEMER'S sexual molestation of a parishoner's son as alleged above, Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN and ST. PASCHAL's knew or should have known that Defendant ROEMER had molested and would continue to molest minors with whom he came in contact.

REDACTED

1 51. In spite of said knowledge, Defendants ARCHBISHOP,
2 ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN, and ST. PASCHAL's continued to employ
3 Defendant ROEMER in said capacity, and failed to warn minors or
4 their parents or guardians of Defendant ROEMER's conduct.

5 52. As a proximate result of said Defendants' failure
6 to warn and failure to exercise reasonable care as above
7 alleged, Plaintiff came into contact with Defendant ROEMER in
8 the course of ST. PASCHAL'S youth activities program, and
9 suffered the injuries as above alleged, which injuries
10 Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN, and ST. PASCHAL's
11 knew, or should have known, would occur.

12 53. As a direct and proximate result of said failure
13 to warn, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer mental
14 and emotional distress and as a proximate result thereof has
15 been and will be required to receive the aid, treatment,
16 counseling and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and
17 physicians, the services of which will cause him to suffer
18 monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will
19 be shown by an amendment to this complaint or according to proof

20 54. As a direct and proximate result of said failure
21 to warn by Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered
22 severe and permanent emotional distress, all to his general
23 damage in a sum within the jurisdiction of this Court.

24 55. The conduct of Defendants, and each of them, as
25 hereinabove alleged, in failing to warn Plaintiff and in
26 continuing to employ Defendant ROEMER in a position where he
27 came in contact with children, was in conscious disregard of the
28 rights of Plaintiff and thereby entitled Plaintiff to punitive
and exemplary damages in a sum to be shown at trial.

REDACTED

6172

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM,
REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

(Assault and Battery, Punitive Damages)

56. Plaintiff REDACTED is a minor fifteen (15) years of age. On 2-23-84 REDACTED Plaintiff's mother, a competent and responsible adult, was appointed by order duly given and made by the above-entitled court, and is now the duly qualified and acting guardian ad litem of the minor Plaintiff in this action.

57. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 9 of this complaint.

58. During the summer of 1980, when Plaintiff was twelve (12) years of age, Plaintiff attended a sports camp sponsored by and held at ST. PASCHAL's from June 16 through June 21, 1980. At various and several times during the course of said camp activities, Defendant ROEMER assaulted and battered Plaintiff by putting his arm around Plaintiff's shoulder, hugging and fondling Plaintiff, placing Defendant ROEMER's head on Plaintiff's shoulder. Plaintiff attempted to avoid Defendant ROEMER during the periods following said conduct, but Defendant ROEMER repeatedly pursued Plaintiff and said, "You can't get away from me." Defendant ROEMER then came up behind Plaintiff and wrapped his arms around him and put his chin on Plaintiff's shoulder. Plaintiff attempted to get away, but Defendant would not allow him to, and continued to fondle him. After the sports activities were over for one of the above-mentioned days,

REDACTED

1 Plaintiff went to the front of the church to wait for his ride.
2 He was sitting on a bench when Defendant ROEMER came up and sat
3 very close to him, forcing his body to touch Plaintiff's, and
4 Defendant ROEMER put his arm around Plaintiff's shoulder.

5 59. Each of the aforementioned acts was offensive to
6 Plaintiff, and by reason of the acts of Defendant ROEMER,
7 Plaintiff was caused to suffer great mental, physical, nervous
8 and emotional pain and suffering. As a result of Plaintiff's
9 injuries, Plaintiff suffered general damages in excess of the
10 jurisdictional minimum of this Court.

11 60. As a further direct and proximate result of the
12 acts of Defendant ROEMER, acting in the course and scope of his
13 employment by Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST.
14 PASCHAL's, and each of them, Plaintiff has incurred and in the
15 future will incur expenses for the services of physicians,
16 nurses and other medical and health care personnel for medical
17 and incidental treatment. The exact amount of such expenses is
18 unknown to Plaintiff at this time. Leave to amend this
19 complaint to set forth said sums will be sought when the same
20 have been ascertained.

21 61. In making the uninvited and unprovoked attacks on
22 Plaintiff as heretofore alleged, Defendant ROEMER acted
23 maliciously and was guilty of wanton and conscious disregard of
24 the rights and feelings of Plaintiff, and by reason thereof
25 Plaintiff demands exemplary and punitive damages against
26 Defendants ROEMER, ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST. PASCHAL's in
27 an amount according to proof.

28 REDACTED /

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM,

REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

(Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress,

Punitive Damages)

62. Plaintiff REDACTED alleges and incorporates by reference all allegations contained in the Ninth cause of action as if set forth fully herein.

63. Defendant ROEMER's conduct was intentional and malicious and done for the purpose of causing Plaintiff to suffer humiliation, mental anguish, and emotional and physical distress, and as a proximate result thereof Plaintiff has been and will be required to receive the aid, treatment, counseling and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and physicians, the services of which will cause him to suffer monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

64. As a direct and proximate result of the intentional, malicious, extreme and outrageous acts of the Defendants, and each of them, as herein above alleged, Plaintiff has suffered severe and permanent emotional distress, all to his general damage in a sum within the jurisdiction of this court.

65. The conduct of the Defendants, and each of them, in doing the acts herein above alleged was malicious and oppressive and Defendants were guilty of wanton disregard of the rights and feelings of Plaintiff and by reason thereof, Plaintiff demands exemplary and punitive damages against Defendants in an amount according to proof.

REDACTED

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED , A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM

REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

(Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress)

65. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation contained in his Ninth and Tenth Causes of Action.

66. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, owed a duty of due care to Plaintiff to exercise reasonable care towards Plaintiff while Plaintiff was on the premises and insure his safety at the church-sponsored sports camp.

67. As a direct and proximate result of the negligent conduct by Defendants, and each of them, as herein alleged, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer severe and permanent mental and emotional distress and as a proximate result thereof, has been required and will continue to receive the aid, treatment, counseling, and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists, and physicians, the services of which will cause him to suffer monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

68. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence of Defendants, and each of them, as above alleged, Plaintiff has suffered severe and permanent emotional distress all to his general damage in a sum within the jurisdictional minimum of this court.

REDACTED

TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

1
2 REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM
3 REDACTED AGAINST DEFENDANTS ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF
4 LOS ANGELES, ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
5 CORPORATION, FATHER COLM O'RYAN, AND ST. PASCHAL'S
6 (Negligent Employment, Punitive Damages)

7 69. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by
8 this reference, each and every allegation contained in his
9 Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh Causes of Action.

10 70. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
11 alleges that Defendants O'RYAN, ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, ST.
12 PASCHAL'S, and DOES 21 through 30 were responsible in some
13 manner for hiring, employing and placing Defendant ROEMER in his
14 position as an employed priest at ST. PASCHAL's.

15 71. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
16 alleges that Defendant ROEMER was in charge of children's
17 services at ST. PASCHAL's. Plaintiff is further informed and
18 believes and thereon alleges that in said capacity, Defendant
19 ROEMER was encouraged by said Defendants to, and did frequently,
20 come in contact with minor children.

21 72. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
22 alleges that prior to placing Defendant ROEMER in said position
23 of employment and after said Defendants were notified of
24 Defendant ROEMER's sexual molestations of a parishoner's son as
25 alleged above, Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN, and
26 ST. PASCHAL's knew or should have known that Defendant ROEMER
27 had molested and would continue to molest minors with whom he
came in contact.

REDACTED

1 73. In spite of said knowledge, Defendants ARCHBISHOP
2 ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN, and ST. PASCHAL's continued to employ De-
3 fendant ROEMER in said capacity, and failed to warn minors or
4 their parents or guardians of Defendant ROEMER's conduct.

5 74. As a proximate result of said Defendants' failure
6 to warn and failure to exercise reasonable care as above alleged
7 Plaintiff came into contact with Defendant ROEMER in the course
8 of ST. PASCHAL'S activities program and suffered the injuries as
9 above alleged, which injuries Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE
10 REDACTED and ST. PASCHAL's knew or should have known, would occur.

11 75. As a direct and proximate result of said failure
12 to warn, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer mental
13 and emotional distress and as a proximate result thereof has
14 been and will be required to receive the aid, treatment, coun-
15 seling and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and
16 physicians, the services of which will cause him to suffer mone-
17 tary damage in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be
18 shown by an amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

19 76. As a direct and proximate result of said failure
20 to warn by Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered
21 severe and permanent emotional distress, all to his general
22 damage in a sum within the jurisdiction of this Court.

23 77. The conduct of Defendants, and each of them, as
24 hereinabove alleged, in failing to warn Plaintiff and in failing
25 to exercise reasonable care towards Plaintiff and in continuing
26 to employ Defendant ROEMER in a position where he came in
27 contact with children was in conscious disregard of the rights
28 of Plaintiff and thereby entitles Plaintiff to punitive and
REDACTED exemplary damages in a sum to be shown at trial.

THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM,
REDACTED AN INDIVIDUAL, AGAINST
DEFENDANTS ST. PASCHAL'S, ARCHBISHOP, AND ARCHDIOCESE
(Breach of Contract)

78. Plaintiff REDACTED (hereinafter 'REDACTED' is a minor nine (9) years of age. On 2.23.84, REDACTED REDACTED Plaintiff's mother, a competent and responsible adult, was appointed by order duly given and made by the above-entitled court, and is now the duly qualified and acting guardian ad litem of a minor Plaintiff in this action.

79. Plaintiffs REDACTED eallege and incorporate herein by reference each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 8 of this complaint.

80. In April or May of 1980, in Thousand Oaks, California, Plaintiff REDACTED entered into a written contract with Defendants ST. PASCHAL's, ARCHBISHOP, and ARCHDIOCESE by the terms of which Plaintiff agreed to pay Defendants valuable consideration for the privilege of having her family attend a religious family retreat week-end sponsored by said Defendants. Said religious family retreat was held at Camp Yolijsa, in San Bernardino, California on May 10 and 11, 1980.

81. An implied obligation of said agreement between Plaintiff REDACTED L and Defendants ST. PASCHAL's, ARCHBISHOP and ARCHDIOCESE was that the religious nature of said retreat would be fostered by said Defendants, and that said Defendants would exercise reasonable care in providing a

1 reasonably safe environment for Plaintiff and her family,
2 including REDACTED Further, there existed in said agreement an
3 implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing.

4 82. On or about May 10 or 11, 1980, said Defendants,
5 and each of them, breached the above-referenced obligations when
6 Defendant ROEMER sexually molested Plaintiff's son, REDACTED
7 REDACTED, as REDACTED asked Defendant ROEMER to aid him in saying
8 his good-night prayers, as further explained hereinafter.

9 83. Plaintiff REDACTED has performed all
10 conditions, covenants and promises required by her to be
11 performed on her part.

12 84. As a result of Defendant's aforementioned breach
13 of the agreement as alleged, Plaintiff REDACTED has
14 incurred, and in the future will incur liability for expenses
15 for the services of physicians and other medical and health care
16 personnel for medical and incidental treatment to her son,
17 Plaintiff REDACTED who suffered severe mental and emotional
18 distress As a consequential result of Defendant ROEMER's acts.
19 The exact amount of such expenses is unknown to Plaintiff
20 REDACTED at this time, but is in excess of the
21 jurisdictional minimum of this court and will be shown at
22 trial.

23 85. As a further result of DEFENDANTS, and each of
24 their, aforementioned breach of the agreement as alleged,
25 Plaintiff REDACTED has suffered mental and emotional
26 distress all to her damage in an amount in excess of the
27 jurisdictional minimum of this court.

28 /

REDACTED

FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

1 REDACTED
2 A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM,
3 REDACTED
4 AN INDIVIDUAL,
5 AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

6 (Assault and Battery, Punitive Damages)

7 86. On or about May 10, 1980 at a family retreat
8 sponsored by Defendant ST. PASCHAL's held at Camp Yolijsa in San
9 Bernardino, California, Plaintiff REDACTED asked Defendant ROEMER
10 to help him say his goodnight prayers. After saying the
11 prayers, Defendant ROEMER, acting in the course and scope of his
12 employment, assaulted and battered Plaintiff REDACTED by reaching
13 down Plaintiff REDACTED pajama bottoms and rubbing Plaintiff's
14 penis while patting Plaintiff on the head and talking to
15 Plaintiff about the church and God. The aforementioned acts were
16 offensive to Plaintiff, and by reason of the acts of Defendant
17 ROEMER, Plaintiff REDACTED was caused to suffer great mental,
18 physical, nervous and emotional pain and suffering. As a result
19 of Plaintiff's injuries, Plaintiff suffered general damages in
20 excess of the jurisdictional minimum of this Court.

21 87. As a further direct and proximate result of the
22 acts of Defendant ROEMER, acting in the course and scope of his
23 employment by Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST.
24 PASCHAL'S, and each of them, Plaintiff has incurred, and in the
25 future will incur further expenses for the services of
26 physicians, nurses and other medical and health care personnel
for medical and incidental treatment. The exact amount of such
expenses is unknown to Plaintiff at this time. Leave to amend
this complaint to set forth said sums will be sought when the
same have been ascertained.

1 88. In making the unprovoked attack on Plaintiff
 2 REDACTED as heretofore alleged, Defendant ROEMER acted maliciously
 3 and was guilty of wanton and conscious disregard of the rights
 4 and feelings of Plaintiff REDACTED and by reason thereof Plaintiff
 5 demands exemplary and punitive damages against Defendants
 6 ROEMER, ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST. PASCHAL's in an amount
 7 to be shown at trial.
 8

9 FIFTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

10 REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN
 11 AD LITEM, REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS
 12 (Intentional Infliction of Emotional
 13 Distress, Punitive Damages)
 14

15 89. Plaintiff REDACTED alleges and incorporates
 16 by reference paragraphs 86 through 88 of his Fourteenth Cause of
 17 Action.
 18

19 90. Defendant ROEMER's conduct was intentional and
 20 malicious and done for the purpose of causing Plaintiff to suffer
 21 humiliation, mental anguish, and emotional and physical
 22 distress, and as a proximate result thereof has been required to
 23 and continues to receive the aid, treatment, counseling and
 24 assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and physicians, the
 25 services of which have caused him to suffer monetary damage in
 26 an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an
 27 amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

28 /

REDACTED /

1 91. As a direct and proximate result of the
2 intentional, malicious, extreme and outrageous acts of the
3 Defendants, and each of them, as hereinabove alleged, Plaintiff
4 has suffered severe and permanent emotional distress, all to
5 his general damage in a sum within the jurisdiction of this
6 court.

7 92. The conduct of the Defendants, and each of them,
8 in doing the acts hereinabove alleged was malicious and
9 oppressive and Defendants were guilty of wanton disregard of the
10 rights and feelings of Plaintiff and by reason thereof,
11 Plaintiff demands exemplary and punitive damages against
12 Defendants in an amount according to proof.

13 /
14 /
15 /
16 /
17 /
18 /
19 /
20 /
21 /
22 /
23 /
24 /
25 /
26 /
27 /

REDACTED

SIXTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED

A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN

AD LITEM, REDACTED

AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

(Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress)

93. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 86 through 88 of his Fourteenth Cause of action and each and every allegation contained in his Fifteen Cause of Action, as if set forth fully herein.

94. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, owed a duty of due care to Plaintiff to exercise reasonable care toward him and to insure his safety at the church-sponsored camp. Defendants, and each of them, breached said duties by failing to prevent DEFENDANT ROEMER from performing the acts previously alleged and by failing to provide for the Plaintiff's safety.

95. As a direct and proximate result of the above alleged conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff sustained great emotional disturbance and shock and injury to his nervous system, all of which has caused and continues to cause, and will cause him great physical and mental pain and suffering, all to his damage in an amount in excess of the jurisdictional minimum of this court. As a direct and proximate result of the negligent conduct as above alleged by Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer mental and emotional distress and as a proximate result thereof, has been required to and continues to receive the aid, treatment, counseling, and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists

REDACTED

1 and physicians, the services of which have caused him to suffer
 2 monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will
 3 be shown by an amendment to this complaint or according to proof

4 96. As a direct and proximate result of the negli-
 5 gence of Defendants, and each of them, as above alleged,
 6 Plaintiff has suffered severe and permanent emotional distress
 7 all to his general damage in a sum within the jurisdictional
 8 minimum of this court.

10 SEVENTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

11 REDACTED , A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM,
 12 REDACTED AGAINST DEFENDANTS ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE,
 13 O'RYAN, AND ST. PASCHAL'S
 14 (Negligent Employment, Punitive Damages)

15
 16 97. Plaintiff^{REDACTED} realleges and incorporates herein
 17 by this reference each and every allegation contained in
 18 paragraphs 86 through 88, inclusive, of his Fourteenth Cause of
 19 Action and each and every allegation contained in his Fifteenth
 20 and Sixteenth Causes of action, as if set forth fully herein.

21 98. Plaintiff^{REDACTED} is informed and believes and
 22 thereon alleges that at all times herein mentioned, Defendants
 23 ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN, and DOES 21 through 30 were
 24 responsible in some manner in hiring, employing and placing
 25 Defendant ROEMER in his position as an employed priest at ST.
 26 PASCHAL'S.

27 99. Plaintiff^{REDACTED} is informed and believes and
 28 thereon alleges that at all times herein mentioned Defendant

REDACTED

1 ROEMER was in charge of children's services at ST. PASCHAL'S.
2 Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges
3 that in said capacity, Defendant ROEMER was encouraged to and
4 did frequently come in contact with minor children.

5 100. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
6 alleges that prior to placing Defendant ROEMER in said position
7 of employment as above-described, Defendants ARCHBISHOP,
8 ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN and ST. PASCHAL'S knew or should have known
9 that Defendant ROEMER had sexually molested and would continue
10 to molest minors with whom he came in contact.

11 101. In spite of said knowledge, Defendants ARCHBISHOP
12 ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN and ST. PASCHAL's, continued to employ
13 Defendant ROEMER in said capacity, and failed to warn minors or
14 their parents or guardians of Defendant ROEMER's conduct.

15 102. As a proximate result of said Defendants' employ-
16 ment of Defendant ROEMER, and ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN
17 and ST. PASCHAL's failure to warn as above-alleged, Plaintiff
18 REDACTED came into contact with Defendant ROEMER and suffered the
19 injuries as above alleged, which injuries Defendants ARCHBISHOP,
20 ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN, and ST. PASCHAL's knew or should have
21 known, would occur.

22 103. As a direct and proximate result of said failure
23 to warn, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer mental
24 and emotional distress and as a proximate result thereof has
25 been required to and continues to receive the aid, treatment,
26 counseling and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and
27 physicians, the services of which have caused him to suffer
28 REDACTED monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will
be shown by an amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

104. As a direct and proximate result of said failure to warn by Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered severe and permanent emotional distress, all to his general damage in a sum within the jurisdiction of this Court.

105. The conduct of Defendants, and each of them, as hereinabove alleged, in continuing to employ Defendant ROEMER and in failing to warn Plaintiff or his parents or guardians was in conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff and thereby entitles Plaintiff to punitive and exemplary damages in a sum to be shown at trial.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray judgment as follows:

AS TO PLAINTIFFS REDACTED

REDACTED

ON ALL CAUSES OF ACTION:

1. For general damages in a sum within the jurisdiction of this court;

2. For medical, psychiatric and other health care expenses according to proof;

3. For exemplary and punitive damages in a sum according to proof;

4. For costs of suit herein incurred;

5. For such other and further relief as this court deems just and proper.

/

/

REDACTED

1 AS TO PLAINTIFFS REDACTED

2 ON THE THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

3 1. For consequential damages according to proof;

4 ON THE FOURTEENTH THROUGH SEVENTEENTH CAUSES OF ACTION

5 2. For general damages in a sum within the
6 jurisdiction of this court;

7 3. For medical, psychiatric and other health care
8 expenses according to proof;

9 4. For exemplary and punitive damages in a sum
10 according to proof;

11 5. For costs of suit herein incurred;

12 6. For such other and further relief as this court
13 deems just and proper.

14
15 Dated: 2/20/84

16 REDACTED

17
18
19 REDACTED
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REDACTED

SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (Aviso a Acusado)

See Attachment "A" incorporated herein
by this reference

**ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES, EDUCATION
AND WELFARE CORPORATION, a corporation**

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (A Ud. le está demandando)

See Attachment "A" incorporated herein
by this reference

FOR COURT USE ONLY
(SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

You have **30 CALENDAR DAYS** after this summons is served on you to file a typewritten response at this court.

A letter or phone call will not protect you; your typewritten response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case.

If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case, and your wages, money and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may call an attorney referral service or a legal aid office (listed in the phone book).

Después de que le entreguen esta citación judicial usted tiene un plazo de **30 DIAS CALENDARIOS** para presentar una respuesta escrita a máquina en esta corte.

Una carta o una llamada telefónica no le ofrecerá protección; su respuesta escrita a máquina tiene que cumplir con las formalidades legales apropiadas si usted quiere que la corte escuche su caso.

Si usted no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso, y le pueden quitar su salario, su dinero y otras cosas de su propiedad sin aviso adicional por parte de la corte.

Existen otros requisitos legales. Puede que usted quiera llamar a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de referencia de abogados o a una oficina de ayuda legal (vea el directorio telefónico).

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y dirección de la corte es)

CASE NUMBER: (Número del Caso)

8 2 7 5 0

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF VENTURA
Hall of Justice, 800 S. Victoria Avenue
Ventura, CA 93009

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:

(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es)

REDACTED

Attorney at Law

340 Rosewood Avenue, Suite "O"
Camarillo, CA 93010

Telephone: (805) 484-0514

RICHARD D. DEAN

DATE:
(Fecha)


FEB 27 1984

Clerk, by
(Actuario)

Dannam. Kue

Deputy
(Delegado)

(SEAL)



NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

1. ☐ as an individual defendant.
2. ☐ as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):
3. ☐ on behalf of (specify):

6153

- under:
- ☒ CCP 416.10 (corporation)
 - ☐ CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation)
 - ☐ CCP 416.40 (association or partnership)
 - ☐ other:

- ☐ CCP 416.60 (minor)
- ☐ CCP 416.70 (conservatee)
- ☐ CCP 416.90 (individual)

4. ☐ by personal delivery on (date):

Attachment "A"**NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (Aviso a Acusado)**

ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF
LOS ANGELES, a California
Corporation; ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS
ANGELES, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
CORPORATION, a California
Corporation; PATRICK ROEMER;
FATHER REDACTED ST. PASCHAL
BAYLON CATHOLIC CHURCH, an
unincorporated association; and
DOES I through 50, inclusive.

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:
(A Ud. le está demandando)

REDACTED

Case No. 82750
Summons

6154

PROOF OF SERVICE — SUMMONS
(Use separate proof of service for each person served)

1. I served the
- a. ☐ summons ☐ complaint ☐ amended summons ☐ amended complaint
☐ completed and blank Case Questionnaires ☐ Other (specify):
- b. on defendant (name):
- c. by serving ☐ defendant ☐ other (name and title or relationship to person served):
- d. ☐ by delivery ☐ at home ☐ at business
 (1) date:
 (2) time:
 (3) address:
- e. ☐ by mailing
 (1) date:
 (2) place:
2. Manner of service (check proper box):
- a. ☐ **Personal service.** By personally delivering copies. (CCP 415.10)
- b. ☐ **Substituted service on corporation, unincorporated association (including partnership), or public entity.** By leaving, during usual office hours, copies in the office of the person served with the person who apparently was in charge and thereafter mailing (by first-class mail, postage prepaid) copies to the person served at the place where the copies were left. (CCP 415.20(a))
- c. ☐ **Substituted service on natural person, minor, conservatee, or candidate.** By leaving copies at the dwelling house, usual place of abode, or usual place of business of the person served in the presence of a competent member of the household or a person apparently in charge of the office or place of business, at least 18 years of age, who was informed of the general nature of the papers, and thereafter mailing (by first-class mail, postage prepaid) copies to the person served at the place where the copies were left. (CCP 415.20(b)) (Attach separate declaration or affidavit stating acts relied on to establish reasonable diligence in first attempting personal service.)
- d. ☐ **Mail and acknowledgment service.** By mailing (by first-class mail or airmail, postage prepaid) copies to the person served, together with two copies of the form of notice and acknowledgment and a return envelope, postage prepaid, addressed to the sender. (CCP 415.30) (Attach completed acknowledgment of receipt.)
- e. ☐ **Certified or registered mail service.** By mailing to an address outside California (by first-class mail, postage prepaid, requiring a return receipt) copies to the person served. (CCP 415.40) (Attach signed return receipt or other evidence of actual delivery to the person served.)
- f. ☐ Other (specify code section):
☐ additional page is attached.
3. The "Notice to the Person Served" (on the summons) was completed as follows (CCP 412.30, 415.10, and 474):
- a. ☐ as an individual defendant.
- b. ☐ as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):
- c. ☐ on behalf of (specify):
 under: ☐ CCP 416.10 (corporation) ☐ CCP 416.60 (minor) ☐ other:
☐ CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation) ☐ CCP 416.70 (conservatee)
☐ CCP 416.40 (association or partnership) ☐ CCP 416.90 (individual)
- d. ☐ by personal delivery on (date):
4. At the time of service I was at least 18 years of age and not a party to this action.
5. Fee for service: \$
6. Person serving:
- a. ☐ California sheriff, marshal, or constable.
- b. ☐ Registered California process server.
- c. ☐ Employee or independent contractor of a registered California process server.
- d. ☐ Not a registered California process server.
- e. ☐ Exempt from registration under Bus. & Prof. Code 22350(b).
- f. Name, address and telephone number and, if applicable, county of registration and number:

6155

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

(For California sheriff, marshal, or constable use only)
 I certify that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date:

Date:

(SIGNATURE)

(SIGNATURE)

(CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (Aviso a Acusado)

COURT USE ONLY
(SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

See Attachment "A" incorporated herein
by this reference
**ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF
LOS ANGELES, a corporation**

**YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:
(A Ud. le está demandando)**

See Attachment "A" incorporated herein
by this reference

<p>You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons is served on you to file a typewritten response at this court.</p> <p>A letter or phone call will not protect you; your typewritten response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case.</p> <p>If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case, and your wages, money and property may be taken without further warning from the court.</p> <p>There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may call an attorney referral service or a legal aid office (listed in the phone book).</p>	<p><i>Después de que le entreguen esta citación judicial usted tiene un plazo de 30 DIAS CALENDARIOS para presentar una respuesta escrita a máquina en esta corte.</i></p> <p><i>Una carta o una llamada telefónica no le ofrecerá protección; su respuesta escrita a máquina tiene que cumplir con las formalidades legales apropiadas si usted quiere que la corte escuche su caso.</i></p> <p><i>Si usted no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso, y le pueden quitar su salario, su dinero y otras cosas de su propiedad sin aviso adicional por parte de la corte.</i></p> <p><i>Existen otros requisitos legales. Puede que usted quiera llamar a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de referencia de abogados o a una oficina de ayuda legal (vea el directorio telefónico).</i></p>
---	---

The name and address of the court is: *(El nombre y dirección de la corte es)*

CASE NUMBER (Número del Caso)
8 2 7 5 0

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF VENTURA
Hall of Justice, 800 S. Victoria Avenue
Ventura, CA 93009

The address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:
(Indique la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es)
REDACTED

Attorney at Law
340 Rosewood Avenue, Suite "O"
Camarillo, CA 93010

Telephone: (805) 484-0514
RICHARD D. DEAN

DATE **FEB 27 1984** Clerk, by **DANNA M. KLEIN**, Deputy
(Actuario) (Delegado)

NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

1. ☐ as an individual defendant.

2. ☐ as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):

3. ☐ on behalf of (specify): **6150**

4. ☒ under:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.10 (corporation)	<input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.60 (minor)
<input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation)	<input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.70 (conservatee)
<input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.40 (association or partnership)	<input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.90 (individual)
<input type="checkbox"/> other:	

5. ☐ by personal delivery on (date):

Attachment "A"

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (Aviso a Acusado)

ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF
LOS ANGELES, a California
Corporation; ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS
ANGELES, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
CORPORATION, a California
Corporation; PATRICK ROEMER;
FATHER REDACTED : ST. PASCHAL
BAYLON CATHOLIC CHURCH, an
unincorporated association; and
DOES I through 50, inclusive.

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:
(A Ud. le está demandando)

REDACTED

Case No. 82750
Summons

6151

PROOF OF SERVICE – SUMMONS

(Use separate proof of service for each person served)

1. I served the

- a. ☐ summons ☐ complaint ☐ amended summons ☐ amended complaint
☐ completed and blank Case Questionnaires ☐ Other (specify):

b. on defendant (name):

c. by serving ☐ defendant ☐ other (name and title or relationship to person served):d. ☐ by delivery ☐ at home ☐ at business

(1) date:

(2) time:

(3) address:

e. ☐ by mailing

(1) date:

(2) place:

2. Manner of service (check proper box):

- a. ☐ **Personal service.** By personally delivering copies. (CCP 415.10)
- b. ☐ **Substituted service on corporation, unincorporated association (including partnership), or public entity.** By leaving, during usual office hours, copies in the office of the person served with the person who apparently was in charge and thereafter mailing (by first-class mail, postage prepaid) copies to the person served at the place where the copies were left. (CCP 415.20(a))
- c. ☐ **Substituted service on natural person, minor, conservatee, or candidate.** By leaving copies at the dwelling house, usual place of abode, or usual place of business of the person served in the presence of a competent member of the household or a person apparently in charge of the office or place of business, at least 18 years of age, who was informed of the general nature of the papers, and thereafter mailing (by first-class mail, postage prepaid) copies to the person served at the place where the copies were left. (CCP 415.20(b)) (Attach separate declaration or affidavit stating acts relied on to establish reasonable diligence in first attempting personal service.)
- d. ☐ **Mail and acknowledgment service.** By mailing (by first-class mail or airmail, postage prepaid) copies to the person served, together with two copies of the form of notice and acknowledgment and a return envelope, postage prepaid, addressed to the sender. (CCP 415.30) (Attach completed acknowledgment of receipt.)
- e. ☐ **Certified or registered mail service.** By mailing to an address outside California (by first-class mail, postage prepaid, requiring a return receipt) copies to the person served. (CCP 415.40) (Attach signed return receipt or other evidence of actual delivery to the person served.)
- f. ☐ **Other (specify code section):**
☐ additional page is attached.

3. The "Notice to the Person Served" (on the summons) was completed as follows (CCP 412.30, 415.10, and 474):

- a. ☐ as an individual defendant.
- b. ☐ as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):
- c. ☐ on behalf of (specify):
under: ☐ CCP 416.10 (corporation) ☐ CCP 416.60 (minor) ☐ other:
☐ CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation) ☐ CCP 416.70 (conservatee)
☐ CCP 416.40 (association or partnership) ☐ CCP 416.90 (individual)

d. ☐ by personal delivery on (date):

4. At the time of service I was at least 18 years of age and not a party to this action.

5. Fee for service: \$

6. Person serving:

- a. ☐ California sheriff, marshal, or constable.
- b. ☐ Registered California process server.
- c. ☐ Employee or independent contractor of a registered California process server.
- d. ☐ Not a registered California process server.
- e. ☐ Exempt from registration under Bus. & Prof. Code 22350(b).

f. Name, address and telephone number and, if applicable, county of registration and number:

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

(For California sheriff, marshal, or constable use only)
I certify that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date:

Date:

6152

(SIGNATURE)

(SIGNATURE)

FILED

FEB 28 1984

RICHARD U. DEAN, County Clerk

By Deputy County Clerk

Penitentiary
#15
#17

REDACTED

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF VENTURA

REDACTED

Case No. 82750

Plaintiffs

VS.

ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP
OF LOS ANGELES, a California
Corporation; ARCEDIOCESE OF LOS
ANGELES, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
CORPORATION, a California
Corporation; PATRICK ROEMER;
FATHER COLM O'RYAN; ST. PASCHAL
BAYLON CATHOLIC CHURCH; an
unincorporated association; and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive.

Defendants.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
(Breack of Contract,
Assault and Battery,
Intentional Infliction
of Emotional Distress,
Negligent Infliction of
Emotional Distress,
Negligence, Punitive
Damages)

6111

Plaintiffs complain of Defendants, and each of them
and allege:

Molestation
#12 #86
#35
#58
#57

REDACTED

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

1
2
3 1. The true names and capacities, whether individual,
4 corporate, associate or otherwise, of Defendants DOES I through
5 50, inclusive, and each of them, are unknown to Plaintiffs, who
6 therefore sue said Defendants by such fictitious names and will
7 seek leave of court to amend this complaint to show their true
8 names and capacities when the same are ascertained. [Said
9 Defendants are sued as principals or agents, servants and
10 employees of said principals and all of the acts performed by
11 them were performed within the [REDACTED] of their
12 authority and employment]

13 2. At all times herein mentioned, each of the
14 Defendants was the [REDACTED] of each of the remaining
15 Defendants, and was acting within the purpose and [REDACTED] of said
16 agency and employment.

17 3. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant POMAN
18 CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES (hereinafter "ARCHBISHOP")
19 was and is a California corporation duly organized and existing
20 under the laws of the State of California and authorized to
21 transact and transacting business in the State of California,
22 with its principal place of business in the County of Los Angeles.

23 4. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant ARCHDIOCESE
24 OF LOS ANGELES, EDUCATION AND WELFARE CORPORATION (hereinafter
25 "ARCHDIOCESE"), was and is a corporation duly organized and
26 existing under the laws of the State of California and authorized
27 to transact and transacting business in the State of California,
28 with its principal place of business in the County of Los Angeles.

REDACTED

1 5. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon
2 allege that at all times herein mentioned, Defendant ST. PASCHAL
3 BAYLON CATHOLIC CHURCH (hereinafter "ST. PASCHAL's") was and is
4 an incorporated association sued herein under the name by which
5 it is known, doing business as a church with its principal
6 office in the City of Thousand Oaks, County of Ventura, State of
7 California.

8 6. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant PATRICK
9 ROEMER (hereinafter "ROEMER") was a priest of the Roman Catholic
10 Church employed by Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST.
11 PASCHAL'S, and each of them, and in doing the acts herein
12 alleged was acting in the [REDACTED] said employment.

13 7. At all times herein mentioned, FATHER COLM O'RYAN
14 (hereinafter "O'RYAN") was a priest of the Roman Catholic Church
15 employed by Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST.
16 PASCHAL's, and each of them, in a managerial capacity, and in
17 doing the acts herein alleged was acting in the [REDACTED]
18 of said employment and in his managerial capacity.

19 8. [Prior to the incident alleged hereinafter,
20 Defendant ROEMER informed various counselors and psychologists
21 employed by the Catholic Church of Defendant ROEMER's tendencies
22 toward pedophilia, his prior sexual molestations of minor
23 children, [REDACTED]
24 [REDACTED] by Defendants ARCHBISHOP,
25 ARCHDIOCESE, and ST. PASCHAL's. Plaintiffs are informed and
26 believe and thereon allege that said counselors, psychologists
27 and other persons knew or should have known that Defendant
28 ROEMER would repeat these acts on minors with whom he would

REDACTED

1 come in contact during the course and scope of his employment.
 2 Said psychologists, counselors and other persons are named
 3 herein as Defendants DOES I through 20. When Plaintiffs
 4 ascertain the true names of said Defendants, Plaintiffs will
 5 seek leave to amend this complaint to add said names.

6 9. REDACTED December 27, 1980, a parishoner parent

7 of a minor who had been sexually molested by Defendant ROEMER
 8 informed Defendant O'RYAN that her son had been severely
 9 sexually molested by Defendant ROEMER and that such act was
 10 committed during the [REDACTED] ROEMER's employment.
 11 Defendant O'RYAN assured said parent that the matter would be
 12 investigated and remedied. Thereafter, having been notified of
 13 Defendant ROEMER's molestation of a minor, Defendants
 14 ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN, and ST. PASCHAL's continued to
 15 employ Defendant ROEMER as a priest, and failed to take any
 16 precautions to insure the safety of minor children coming into
 17 contact with Defendant ROEMER. Moreover, said Defendants
 18 continued to employ Defendant ROEMER in a position at ST.
 19 PASCHAL's, placing him in charge of children's services and
 20 encouraging him to use his position of authority as priest and
 21 teacher to lead the children of ST. PASCHAL's parishioners in
 22 their religious learning at all times herein mentioned.

23 /

24 /

25 /

26 /

27 /

28 /

REDACTED

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN
AD LITEM, REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS
(Assault and Battery, Punitive Damages)

10. Plaintiff REDACTED is a minor ^{ten (10)} ~~thirteen (13)~~
years of age. On FEB 27 84, REDACTED Plaintiff's
mother, a competent and responsible adult, was appointed by
Order duly given and made by the above-entitled court, and is
now the duly qualified and acting guardian ad litem of the minor
Plaintiff in this action.

11. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by
reference each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 9 of
this Complaint as though fully set forth.

(12) On or about January 26, 1981, Plaintiff was at
Defendant ST. PASCHAL's for Catholic Christian classes.
Defendant ROEMER came outside of his office and asked Plaintiff
to come inside and look at some pictures. Defendant ROEMER then
assaulted and battered Plaintiff by [lifting Plaintiff up and
placing Plaintiff on Defendant's leg.] Defendant showed
Plaintiff some pictures and [put his hand under Plaintiff's shirt
and rubbed Plaintiff's stomach. Defendant ROEMER then slid his
hand down Plaintiff's pants and inside Plaintiff's underpants
and rubbed Plaintiff's penis for several minutes. Defendant
also kissed Plaintiff on the neck, near the ear, as he was
rubbing Plaintiff.]

6115

1 13. Each of the aforementioned acts was offensive to
2 Plaintiff, and by reason of the acts of Defendant ROEMER,
3 Plaintiff was caused to suffer great mental, physical, nervous
4 and emotional pain and suffering. As a result of Plaintiff's
5 injuries, Plaintiff suffered general damages in excess of the
6 jurisdictional minimum of this Court.

7 14. As a further direct and proximate result of the
8 acts of Defendant ROEMER, acting in the course and scope of his
9 employment by Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST.
10 PASCHAL's, and each of them, Plaintiff has incurred, and in the
11 future will incur further expenses for the services of
12 physicians, nurses, and other medical and health care personnel
13 for medical and incidental treatment. The exact amount of such
14 expenses is unknown to Plaintiff at this time. Leave to amend
15 this Complaint to set forth said sums will be sought when the
16 same have been ascertained.

17 ✓15. In making the uninvited and unprovoked attack on
18 Plaintiff as heretofore alleged, Defendant ROEMER acted
19 maliciously and was guilty of wanton and conscious disregard of
20 the rights and feelings of Plaintiff, and by reason thereof
21 Plaintiff demands exemplary and punitive damages against
22 Defendants ROEMER, ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST. PASCHAL's in
23 an amount according to proof.

24 /

25 /

26 /

27 /

28 /

REDACTED

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM
 RE¹ REDACTED, AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

(Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress,
 Punitive Damages)

16. Plaintiff REDACTED realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations contained in his First Cause of Action, as if set forth fully herein.

17. Defendant ROEMER's conduct was intentional and malicious and done for the purpose of causing Plaintiff to suffer humiliation, mental anguish, and emotional and physical distress, and as a proximate result thereof has been required to and will continue to receive the aid, treatment, counseling and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and physicians, the services of which have caused him to suffer monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

18. As a direct and proximate result of the intentional, malicious, extreme and outrageous acts of the Defendants, and each of them, as herein above alleged, Plaintiff has suffered severe and permanent emotional distress, all to his general damage in a sum within the jurisdiction of this court.

19. The conduct of the Defendants, and each of them, in doing the acts herein above alleged was malicious and oppressive and Defendants were guilty of wanton disregard of the rights and feelings of Plaintiff and by reason thereof, Plaintiff demands exemplary and punitive damages against

Defendants in an amount according to proof.

REDACTED

6117

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED

A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM

REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

(Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress)

20. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by this reference each and every allegation contained his First, and Second Causes of Action, as if set forth fully herein.

21. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, [owed a duty of care] to Plaintiff to exercise reasonable care toward Plaintiff while Plaintiff was on the premises of ST. PASCHAL's and to insure his safety at the church-sponsored above-described Catholic education classes. Defendants, and each of them, breached said duty as previously alleged herein by failing to prevent Defendant ROEMER from performing the acts previously alleged and by failing to provide for the Plaintiff's safety.

22. As a direct and proximate result of the negligent conduct by Defendants, and each of them, as herein alleged, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer severe and permanent mental and emotional distress and as a proximate result thereof, has been required to and will continue to receive the aid, treatment, counseling, and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists, and physicians, the services of which have caused him to suffer monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

REDACTED

[illegible]

REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGHE HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM,
REDACTED AGAINST DEFENDANTS ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF
LOS ANGELES, ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
CORPORATION, FATHER COLM O'RYAN, AND ST. PASCHAL'S
(Negligent Employment, Punitive Damages)

24. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by this reference, each and every allegation contained his First, Second, and Third Causes of Action, as if set forth fully herein

25. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants O'RYAN, ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, ST. PASCHAL'S, and DOES 21 through 30 were responsible in some manner for hiring, employing, and placing Defendant ROEMER in his position as an employed priest at ST. PASHAL's.

26. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant ROEMER was in charge of children's services at ST. PASHAL's. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that in said capacity, Defendant ROEMER was encouraged by said Defendants to, and did frequently, come in contact with minor children.

27. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that prior to placing Defendant ROEMER in said position of employment and after said Defendants were notified of Defendant ROEMER'S sexual molestation of a parishoner's son as alleged above, Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN and ST. PASCHAL's knew or should have known that Defendant ROEMER had molested and would continue to molest minors with whom he came in contact.

1 28. [In spite of said knowledge, Defendants ARCHBISHOP,
2 ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN and ST. PASCHAL's continued to employ
3 Defendant ROEMER in said capacity, and failed to warn minors or
4 their parents or guardians of Defendant ROEMER's conduct.]

5 29. As a proximate result of said Defendants' failure
6 to warn and failure to exercise reasonable care as above
7 alleged, Plaintiff came into contact with Defendant ROEMER in
8 the course of ST. PASCHAL'S youth activities program and
9 suffered the injuries as above alleged, which injuries Defen-
10 dants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN and ST. PASCHAL's knew, or
11 should have known, would occur.

12 30. As a direct and proximate result of said failure
13 to warn, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer mental
14 and emotional distress and as a proximate result thereof has
15 been required to and will continue to receive the aid, treat-
16 ment, counseling and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists
17 and physicians, the services of which have caused him to suffer
18 monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will
19 be shown by an amendment to this complaint or according to proof

20 31. As a direct and proximate result of said failure
21 to warn by Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered
22 severe and permanent emotional distress, all to his general
23 damage in a sum within the jurisdiction of this court.

24 32. The conduct of Defendants, and each of them, as
25 hereinabove alleged, in failing to warn Plaintiff; in failing to
26 exercise reasonable care towards Plaintiff and in continuing to
27 employ Defendant ROEMER in a position where he was in contact
28 with children was in conscious disregard of the rights of
Plaintiff and thereby entitles Plaintiff to punitive and

REDACTED

6121

1 exemplary damages in a sum to be shown at trial.

3 FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

4 REDACTED

A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN

5 AD LITEM, REDACTED , AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

6 (Assault and Battery, Punitive Damages)

7 33. Plaintiff REDACTED is a minor thirteen
8 (13) years of age. On FEB 23 84, REDACTED Plaintiff's
9 mother, a competent and responsible adult, was appointed by
10 order duly given and made by the above-entitled court, and is
11 now the duly qualified and acting guardian ad litem of the minor
12 Plaintiff in this action.

13 34. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by
14 reference each and every allegation contained in the paragraphs
15 1 through 9 of this Complaint as though fully set forth.

16 (35). On or about January 19, 1981, while Defendant
17 ROEMER was hearing Plaintiff's confession at Defendant, ST.
18 PASCHAL'S, Defendant ROEMER assaulted and battered Plaintiff by
19 [rubbing his stomach, chest, and underarm area, touching skin
20 under his shirt, while Defendant and Plaintiff were sitting side
21 by side in chairs. During the confession, Defendant also
22 assaulted and battered Plaintiff by kissing him repeatedly on
23 the right ear.

24 36. Each of the aforementioned acts was offensive to
25 Plaintiff, and by reason of the acts of Defendant ROEMER,
26 Plaintiff was caused to suffer great mental, physical, nervous
27 and emotional pain and suffering. As a result of Plaintiff's
28 injuries, general damages in excess of the
REDACTED jurisdict s Court.

6122

1 37. As a further direct and proximate result of the
 2 acts of Defendant ROEMER, acting in the course and scope of his
 3 employment by Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST.
 4 PASCHAL's, and each of them, Plaintiff has incurred and in the
 5 future will incur expenses for the services of physicians,
 6 nurses and other medical and health care personnel for medical
 7 and incidental treatment. The exact amount of such expenses if
 8 unknown to Plaintiff at this time. Leave to amend this
 9 complaint to set forth said sums will be sought when the same
 10 have been ascertained.

11 38. In making the uninvited and unprovoked attack on
 12 Plaintiff as heretofore alleged, Defendant ROEMER acted
 13 maliciously and was guilty of wanton and conscious disregard of
 14 the rights and feelings of Plaintiff, and by reason thereof
 15 Plaintiff demands exemplary and punitive damages against
 16 Defendants ROEMER, ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST. PASCHAL's in
 17 an amount according to proof.

18
 19 SIXTE CAUSE OF ACTION
 20

21 REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD
 22 LITEM, REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS
 23 (Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress,
 24 ✓Punitive Damages)

25
 26 39. Plaintiff REDACTED realleges and
 27 incorporates by reference all allegations contained in the
 28 REDACTED Fifth Cause of action herein as if set forth fully.

1 40. Defendant ROEMER's conduct was intentional and
2 malicious and done for the purpose of causing Plaintiff to
3 suffer humiliation, mental anguish, and emotional and physical
4 distress, and as a proximate result thereof Plaintiff has been
5 and will be required to receive the aid, treatment, counseling
6 and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and physicians,
7 the services of which will cause him to suffer monetary damage
8 in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an
9 amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

10
11 41. As a direct and proximate result of the
12 intentional, malicious, extreme and outrageous acts of the
13 Defendants, and each of them, as herein above alleged, Plaintiff
14 has suffered severe and permanent emotional distress, all to his
15 general damage in a sum within the jurisdiction of this court.

16
17 42. The conduct of the Defendants, and each of them,
18 in doing the acts herein above alleged was malicious and
19 oppressive and Defendants were guilty of wanton disregard of the
20 rights and feelings of Plaintiff and by reason thereof,
21 Plaintiff demands exemplary and punitive damages against
22 Defendants in an amount according to proof.

23 /

24 /

25 /

26 /

27 /

28
REDACTED

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED

A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH

HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM, REDACTED . AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

(Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress)

43. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation contained in his Fifth and Sixth Causes of Action as if set forth fully herein.

44. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, owed a duty of due care to Plaintiff to exercise reasonable care towards Plaintiff while Plaintiff was on the premises of Defendant ST. PASCHAL's and while Plaintiff was participating in confession. Defendants, and each of them, breached said duty by failing to prevent Defendant ROEMER from performing the acts previously alleged and by failing to provide for the Plaintiff's safety.

45. As a direct and proximate result of the negligent conduct by Defendants, and each of them, as herein alleged, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer severe and permanent mental and emotional distress and as a proximate result thereof, has been required and will continue to receive the aid, treatment, counseling, and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists, and physicians, the services of which will cause him to suffer monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

46. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence of Defendants, and each of them, as above alleged, Plaintiff has suffered severe and permanent emotional distress all to his general damage in a sum within the jurisdictional minimum of this court.

REDACTED

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED

A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN
 AD LITEM, REDACTED
 AGAINST DEFENDANTS ROMAN CATHOLIC
 ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES, ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
 EDUCATION AND WELFARE CORPORATION, FATHER REDACTED
 AND ST. PASCHAL'S

(Negligent Employment, Punitive Damages)

47. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by
 this reference all the allegations contained in his Fifth, Sixth
 Seventh and Eighth Causes of Action.

48. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
 alleges that Defendants O'RYAN, ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, ST.
 PASCHAL'S, and DOES 21 through 30 were responsible in some
 manner for hiring, employing, and placing Defendant ROEMER in
 his position as an employed priest at ST. PASCHAL'S.

49. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
 alleges that Defendant ROEMER was in charge of children's
 services at ST. PASCHAL'S. Plaintiff is further informed and
 believes and thereon alleges that in said capacity, Defendant
 ROEMER was encouraged by said Defendants to, and did frequently,
 come in contact with minor children.

50. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
 alleges that prior to placing Defendant ROEMER in said position
 of employment, and after said Defendants were notified of
 Defendant ROEMER'S sexual molestation of a parishoner's son as
 alleged above, Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN and
 ST. PASCHAL'S knew or should have known that Defendant ROEMER
 had molested and would continue to molest minors with whom he
 came in contact.

REDACTED

1 51. In spite of said knowledge, Defendants ARCHBISHOP,
2 ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN, and ST. PASCHAL's continued to employ
3 Defendant ROEMER in said capacity, and failed to warn minors or
4 their parents or guardians of Defendant ROEMER's conduct.

5 52. As a proximate result of said Defendants' failure
6 to warn and failure to exercise reasonable care as above
7 alleged, Plaintiff came into contact with Defendant ROEMER in
8 the course of ST. PASCHAL'S youth activities program, and
9 suffered the injuries as above alleged, which injuries
10 Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN, and ST. PASCHAL's
11 knew, or should have known, would occur.

12 53. As a direct and proximate result of said failure
13 to warn, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer mental
14 and emotional distress and as a proximate result thereof has
15 been and will be required to receive the aid, treatment,
16 counseling and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and
17 physicians, the services of which will cause him to suffer
18 monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will
19 be shown by an amendment to this complaint or according to proof

20 54. As a direct and proximate result of said failure
21 to warn by Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered
22 severe and permanent emotional distress, all to his general
23 damage in a sum within the jurisdiction of this Court.

24 55. The conduct of Defendants, and each of them, as
25 hereinabove alleged, in failing to warn Plaintiff and in
26 continuing to employ Defendant ROEMER in a position where he
27 came in contact with children, was in conscious disregard of the
28 rights of Plaintiff and thereby entitled Plaintiff to punitive
and exemplary damages in a sum to be shown at trial.

REDACTED

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM,
 REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS
 (Assault and Battery, Punitive Damages)

56. Plaintiff REDACTED is a minor fifteen (15) years of age. On 2-23-84 REDACTED Plaintiff's mother, a competent and responsible adult, was appointed by order duly given and made by the above-entitled court, and is now the duly qualified and acting guardian ad litem of the minor Plaintiff in this action.

57. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 9 of this complaint.

58. During the summer of 1980, when Plaintiff was twelve (12) years of age, Plaintiff attended a sports camp sponsored by and held at ST. PASCHAL's from June 16 through June 21, 1980. At various and several times during the course of said camp activities, [Defendant ROEMER] assaulted and battered Plaintiff by [putting his arm around Plaintiff's shoulder, hugging and fondling Plaintiff, placing Defendant ROEMER's head on Plaintiff's shoulder.] Plaintiff attempted to avoid Defendant ROEMER during the periods following said conduct, but Defendant ROEMER repeatedly pursued Plaintiff and said, "You can't get away from me." [Defendant ROEMER then came up behind Plaintiff and wrapped his arms around him and put his chin on Plaintiff's shoulder. Plaintiff attempted to get away, but Defendant would not allow him to, and continued to fondle him.] After the sports activities were over for one red days,

1 Plaintiff went to the front of the church to wait for his ride.
 2 [He was sitting on a bench when Defendant ROEMER came up and sat
 3 very close to him, forcing his body to touch Plaintiff's, and
 4 Defendant ROEMER put his arm around Plaintiff's shoulder.]

5 59. Each of the aforementioned acts was offensive to
 6 Plaintiff, and by reason of the acts of Defendant ROEMER,
 7 Plaintiff was caused to suffer great mental, physical, nervous
 8 and emotional pain and suffering. As a result of Plaintiff's
 9 injuries, Plaintiff suffered general damages in excess of the
 10 jurisdictional minimum of this Court.

11 60. As a further direct and proximate result of the
 12 acts of Defendant ROEMER, acting in the [REDACTED] of his
 13 employment by Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST.
 14 PASCHAL's, and each of them, Plaintiff has incurred and in the
 15 future will incur expenses for the services of physicians,
 16 nurses and other medical and health care personnel for medical
 17 and incidental treatment. The exact amount of such expenses is
 18 unknown to Plaintiff at this time. Leave to amend this
 19 complaint to set forth said sums will be sought when the same
 20 have been ascertained.

21 61. In making the uninvited and unprovoked attacks on
 22 Plaintiff as heretofore alleged, Defendant ROEMER acted
 23 maliciously and was guilty of wanton and conscious disregard of
 24 the rights and feelings of Plaintiff,] and by reason thereof
 25 Plaintiff demands [exemplary and punitive damages] against
 26 Defendants ROEMER, ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST. PASCHAL's in
 27 an amount according to proof.

28
 REDACTED /

REDACTED

A.
REDACTEDNINTH CAUSE OF ACTIONAND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM,
AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTSinfliction of Emotional Distress,
Punitive (damages) ✓

REDACTED

alleges and incorporates
contained in the Ninth cause of

herein.

he purpose of causing Plaintiff to
anguish, and emotional and physicalresult thereof Plaintiff has been
the aid, treatment, counseling
psychologists and physicians,to suffer monetary damage
which will be shown by an
ing to proof.result of the
eous acts] of the
e alleged, Plaintiff
stress, all to his
of this co

each

6130

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

1
2 REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM
3 REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS
4 (Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress)
5

6 65. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by
7 reference each and every allegation contained in his Ninth and
8 Tenth Causes of Action. (P)

9 66. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and
10 each of them, owed a duty of due care to Plaintiff to exercise
11 reasonable care towards Plaintiff while Plaintiff was on the
12 premises and insure his safety at the church-sponsored sports
13 camp.

14 67. As a direct and proximate result of the negligent
15 conduct by Defendants, and each of them, as herein alleged,
16 Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer severe and
17 permanent mental and emotional distress and as a proximate
18 result thereof, has been required and will continue to receive
19 the aid, treatment, counseling, and assistance of psychiatrists,
20 psychologists, and physicians, the services of which will cause
21 him to suffer monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained,
22 but which will be shown by an amendment to this complaint or
23 according to proof.

24 68. As a direct and proximate result of the
25 negligence of Defendants, and each of them, as above alleged,
26 Plaintiff has suffered severe and permanent emotional distress
27 all to his general damage in a sum within the jurisdictional
28 minimum of this court.
REDACTED

TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED

REDACTED

A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM
AGAINST DEFENDANTS ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF
LOS ANGELES, ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
CORPORATION, FATHER COLM O'RYAN, AND ST. PASCHAL'S
(Negligent Employment, Punitive Damages) ✓?

69. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by
this reference, each and every allegation contained in his
Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh Causes of Action.

70. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
alleges that Defendants O'RYAN, ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, ST.
PASCHAL'S, and DOES 21 through 30 were responsible in some
manner for hiring, employing and placing Defendant ROEMER in his
position as an employed priest at ST. PASCHAL'S.

71. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
alleges that Defendant ROEMER was in charge of children's
services at ST. PASCHAL'S. Plaintiff is further informed and
believes and thereon alleges that in said capacity, Defendant
ROEMER was encouraged by said Defendants to, and did frequently,
come in contact with minor children.

72. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
alleges that prior to placing Defendant ROEMER in said position
of employment and after said Defendants were notified of
Defendant ROEMER's sexual molestations of a parishoner's son as
alleged above, Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN, and
ST. PASCHAL'S knew or should have known that Defendant ROEMER
had molested and would continue to molest minors with whom he
came in contact.

REDACTED

73. In spite of said knowledge, Defendants ARCHBISHOP ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN, and ST. PASCHAL's continued to employ Defendant ROEMER in said capacity, and failed to warn minors or their parents or guardians of Defendant ROEMER's conduct.

74. As a proximate result of said Defendants' failure to warn and failure to exercise reasonable care as above alleged Plaintiff came into contact with Defendant ROEMER in the course of ST. PASCHAL'S activities program and suffered the injuries as above alleged, which injuries Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE O'RYAN, and ST. PASCHAL's knew or should have known, would occur.

75. As a direct and proximate result of said failure to warn, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer mental and emotional distress and as a proximate result thereof has been and will be required to receive the aid, treatment, counseling and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and physicians, the services of which will cause him to suffer monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

76. As a direct and proximate result of said failure to warn by Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered severe and permanent emotional distress, all to his general damage in a sum within the jurisdiction of this Court.

77. The conduct of Defendants, and each of them, as hereinabove alleged, in failing to warn Plaintiff and in failing to exercise reasonable care towards Plaintiff and in continuing to employ Defendant ROEMER in a position where he came in contact with children was in conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff and thereby entitles Plaintiff to punitive and exemplary damages in a sum to be shown at trial.

REDACTED

THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED

A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM,

REDACTED

AN INDIVIDUAL, AGAINST

DEFENDANTS ST. PASCHAL'S, ARCHBISHOP, AND ARCHDIOCESE

(Breach of Contract)

78. Plaintiff REDACTED (hereinafter REDACTED) is

a minor nine (9) years of age. On 2-23-84, REDACTED

REDACTED Plaintiff's mother, a competent and responsible adult, was appointed by order duly given and made by the above-entitled court, and is now the duly qualified and acting guardian ad litem of a minor Plaintiff in this action.

79. Plaintiffs REDACTED reallege and incorporate herein by reference each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 8 of this complaint.

80. In April or May of 1980, in Thousand Oaks, California, Plaintiff REDACTED entered into a written contract with Defendants ST. PASCHAL's, ARCHBISHOP, and ARCHDIOCESE by the terms of which Plaintiff agreed to pay Defendants valuable consideration for the privilege of having her family attend a religious family retreat week-end sponsored by said Defendants. Said religious family retreat was held at Camp Yolijsa, in San Bernardino, California on May 10 and 11, 1980.

81. An implied obligation of said agreement between Plaintiff REDACTED and Defendants ST. PASCHAL's, ARCHBISHOP and ARCHDIOCESE was that the religious nature of said retreat would be fostered by said Defendants, and that said Defendants would exercise reasonable care in provi-

REDACTED

1 reasonably safe environment for Plaintiff and her family,
 2 including REDACTED Further, there existed in said agreement an
 3 implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing.

4 (82.) On or about May 10 or 11, 1980, said Defendants,
 5 and each of them, breached the above-referenced obligations when
 6 [Defendant ROEMER sexually molested Plaintiff's son, REDACTED
 7 REDACTED as REDACTED asked Defendant ROEMER to aid him in saying
 8 his good-night prayers,] as further explained hereinafter.

9 83. Plaintiff REDACTED has performed all
 10 conditions, covenants and promises required by her to be
 11 performed on her part.

12 84. As a result of Defendant's aforementioned breach
 13 of the agreement as alleged, Plaintiff REDACTED as
 14 incurred, and in the future will incur liability for expenses
 15 for the services of physicians and other medical and health care
 16 personnel for medical and incidental treatment to her son,
 17 Plaintiff REDACTED who suffered severe mental and emotional
 18 distress As a consequential result of Defendant ROEMER's acts.
 19 The exact amount of such expenses is unknown to Plaintiff
 20 REDACTED at this time, but is in excess of the
 21 jurisdictional minimum of this court and will be shown at
 22 trial.

23 85. As a further result of DEFENDANTS, and each of
 24 their, aforementioned breach of the agreement as alleged,
 25 Plaintiff REDACTED has suffered mental and emotional
 26 distress all to her damage in an amount in excess of the
 27 jurisdictional minimum of this court.

28 REDACTED /

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED

A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM,

REDACTED

AND REDACTED

AN INDIVIDUAL,

AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

(Assault and Battery, Punitive Damages)

86. On or about May 10, 1985 at a family retreat sponsored by Defendant ST. PASCHAL's held at Camp Yolijsa in San Bernardino, California, Plaintiff REDACTED asked Defendant ROEMER to help him say his goodnight prayers. After saying the prayers, [Defendant ROEMER] acting in the [REDACTED] his employment, assaulted and battered Plaintiff REDACTED by reaching down Plaintiff REDACTED pajama bottoms and rubbing Plaintiff's penis while patting Plaintiff on the head and talking to Plaintiff about the church and God. The aforementioned acts were offensive to Plaintiff, and by reason of the acts of Defendant ROEMER, Plaintiff REDACTED was caused to suffer great mental, physical, nervous and emotional pain and suffering. As a result of Plaintiff's injuries, Plaintiff suffered general damages in excess of the jurisdictional minimum of this Court.

87. As a further direct and proximate result of the acts of Defendant ROEMER, acting in the course and scope of his employment by Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST. PASCHAL'S, and each of them, Plaintiff has incurred, and in the future will incur further expenses for the services of physicians, nurses and other medical and health care personnel for medical and incidental treatment. The exact amount of such expenses is unknown to Plaintiff at this time. Leave to amend this complaint to set forth said sums will be sought when the same have been ascertained.

1 88. In making the unprovoked attack on Plaintiff
 2 REDACTED s heretofore alleged, Defendant ROEMER acted maliciously
 3 and was guilty of wanton and conscious disregard of the rights
 4 and feelings of Plaintiff REDACTED and by reason thereof Plaintiff
 5 demands exemplary and punitive damages against Defendants
 6 ROEMER, ARCHEISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST. PASCEAL's in an amount
 7 to be shown at trial.
 8

9
 10 FIFTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

11 REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGE HIS GUARDIAN
 12 AD LITEM, REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS
 13 (Intentional Infliction of Emotional
 14 Distress/Punitive Damages)

15 89. Plaintiff REDACTED realleges and incorporates
 16 by reference paragraphs 86 through 88 of his Fourteenth Cause of
 17 Action.
 18

19 90. Defendant ROEMER's conduct was intentional and
 20 malicious and done for the purpose of causing Plaintiff to suffer
 21 humiliation, mental anguish, and emotional and physical
 22 distress, and as a proximate result thereof has been required to
 23 and continues to receive the aid, treatment, counseling and
 24 assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and physicians, the
 25 services of which have caused him to suffer monetary damage in
 26 an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an
 27 amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

28 REDACTED

6137

1 91. As a direct and proximate result of the
2 intentional, malicious, extreme and outrageous acts of the
3 Defendants, and each of them, as hereinabove alleged, Plaintiff
4 has suffered severe and permanent emotional distress, all to
5 his general damage in a sum within the jurisdiction of this
6 court.

7 92. The conduct of the Defendants, and each of them,
8 in doing the acts hereinabove alleged was malicious and
9 oppressive and Defendants were guilty of wanton disregard of the
10 rights and feelings of Plaintiff and by reason thereof,
11 Plaintiff demands exemplary and punitive damages against
12 Defendants in an amount according to proof.

13 /
14 /
15 /
16 /
17 /
18 /
19 /
20 /
21 /
22 /
23 /
24 /
25 /
26 /
27 /

28

REDACTED

6138

SIXTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED

A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN

AD LITEM, REDACTED

AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

(Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress)

93. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 86 through 88 of his Fourteenth Cause of action and each and every allegation contained in his Fifteen Cause of Action, as if set forth fully herein.

94. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, owed a duty of due care to Plaintiff to exercise reasonable care toward him and to insure his safety at the church-sponsored camp. Defendants, and each of them, breached said duties by failing to prevent DEFENDANT ROEMER from performing the acts previously alleged and by failing to provide for the Plaintiff's safety.

95. As a direct and proximate result of the above alleged conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff sustained great emotional disturbance and shock and injury to his nervous system, all of which has caused and continues to cause, and will cause him great physical and mental pain and suffering, all to his damage in an amount in excess of the jurisdictional minimum of this court. As a direct and proximate result of the negligent conduct as above alleged by Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer mental and emotional distress and as a proximate result thereof, has been required to and continues to receive the aid, treatment, counseling, and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists

REDACTED

1 and physicians, the services of which have caused him to suffer
 2 monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will
 3 be shown by an amendment to this complaint or according to proof

4 96. As a direct and proximate result of the negli-
 5 gence of Defendants, and each of them, as above alleged,
 6 Plaintiff has suffered severe and permanent emotional distress
 7 all to his general damage in a sum within the jurisdictional
 8 minimum of this court.

9
 10 SEVENTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

11 REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND TEROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM,
 12 REDACTED AGAINST DEFENDANTS ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE,
 13 O'RYAN, AND ST. PASCHAL'S ?
 14 (Negligent Employment, ✓ Punitive Damages)

15
 16 97. Plaintiff REDACTED realleges and incorporates herein
 17 by this reference each and every allegation contained in
 18 paragraphs 86 through 88, inclusive, of his Fourteenth Cause of
 19 Action and each and every allegation contained in his Fifteenth
 20 and Sixteenth Causes of action, as if set forth fully herein.

21 98. Plaintiff REDACTED is informed and believes and
 22 thereon alleges that at all times herein mentioned, Defendants
 23 ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN, and DOES 21 through 30 were
 24 responsible in some manner in hiring, employing and placing
 25 Defendant ROEMER in his position as an employed priest at ST.
 26 PASCHAL'S.

27 99. Plaintiff REDACTED is informed and believes and
 28 thereon alleges that at all times herein mentioned Defendant
 REDACTED

1 ROEMER was in charge of children's services at ST. PASCHAL'S.
2 Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges
3 that in said capacity, Defendant ROEMER was encouraged to and
4 did frequently come in contact with minor children.

5 100. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
6 alleges that prior to placing Defendant ROEMER in said position
7 of employment as above-described, Defendants ARCHBISHOP,
8 ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN and ST. PASCHAL'S knew or should have known
9 that Defendant ROEMER had sexually molested and would continue
10 to molest minors with whom he came in contact.

11 101. In spite of said knowledge, Defendants ARCHBISHOP
12 ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN and ST. PASCHAL'S, continued to employ
13 Defendant ROEMER in said capacity, and [failed to warn] minors or
14 their parents or guardians of Defendant ROEMER's conduct.

REDACTED 102. As a proximate result of said Defendants' employ-
ment of Defendant ROEMER, and ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN
and ST. PASCHAL'S failure to warn as above-alleged, Plaintiff
REDACTED came into contact with Defendant ROEMER and suffered the
injuries as above alleged, which injuries Defendants ARCHBISHOP,
ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN, and ST. PASCHAL'S knew or should have
21 known, would occur.

22 103. As a direct and proximate result of said failure
23 to warn, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer mental
24 and emotional distress and as a proximate result thereof has
25 been required to and continues to receive the aid, treatment,
26 counseling and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and
27 physicians, the services of which have caused him to suffer
28 monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will
REDACTED be shown by an amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

104. As a direct and proximate result of said failure to warn by Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered severe and permanent emotional distress, all to his general damage in a sum within the jurisdiction of this Court.

105. The conduct of Defendants, and each of them, as hereinabove alleged, in continuing to employ Defendant ROEMER and in failing to warn Plaintiff or his parents or guardians was in conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff and thereby entitles Plaintiff to punitive and exemplary damages in a sum to be shown at trial.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray judgment as follows:

AS TO PLAINTIFFS REDACTED

REDACTED

ON ALL CAUSES OF ACTION:

1. For general damages in a sum within the jurisdiction of this court;

2. For medical, psychiatric and other health care expenses according to proof;

3. For exemplary and punitive damages in a sum according to proof;

4. For costs of suit herein incurred;

5. For such other and further relief as this court deems just and proper.

/

/

REDACTED

1 AS TO PLAINTIFFS REDACTED

2 ON THE THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

3 1. For consequential damages according to proof;

4 ON THE FOURTEENTH THROUGH SEVENTEENTH CAUSES OF ACTION

5 2. For general damages in a sum within the
6 jurisdiction of this court;

7 3. For medical, psychiatric and other health care
8 expenses according to proof;

9 (4.) For exemplary and punitive damages in a sum
10 according to proof;

11 5. For costs of suit herein incurred;

12 6. For such other and further relief as this court
13 deems just and proper.

14
15 Dated: 2/20/84

16
17 REDACTED

18
19 REDACTED

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 REDACTED

Apr 22, 1984

Dear REDACTED

I have enclosed two copies
of the summons + complaint; one
for REDACTED and the
other for your file.

Please call me if you need
anything else.

REDACTED

L.A. archdiocese sued over child molestations by priest

Mothers of four boys seeking damages for psychological trauma in suit

By WALT STEGMEIR
Daily News Staff Writer

The archdiocese of Los Angeles was sued Thursday over sexual molestations committed more than three years ago by a Thousand Oaks priest.

The mothers of four boys who the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer was accused of molesting filed the civil lawsuit in Ventura County Superior Court.

Roemer, 39, pleaded no contest to three counts of felony lewd behavior with children and was found to be a mentally disordered sex offender. Altogether the district attorney's office charged that Roemer fondled eight boys.

Defendants in the lawsuit are the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Los Angeles, St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church in Thousand Oaks, Roemer, and his supervisor at the time, the Rev. Colm O'Ryan.

The mothers are seeking unspecified monetary damages for psychological trauma and emotional suffering they say resulted from incidents that occurred in 1980 and 1981 involving Roemer.

Roemer was a priest at St. Paschal Baylon. In February 1981, he was charged with five counts

of lewd behavior with young boys and three counts of misdemeanor child annoyance. He admitted to sheriff's deputies that he molested the children, according to court documents.

Roemer spent 22 months in Atascadero State Hospital before being released on probation last May. He was last living in the San Fernando Valley and working in West Los Angeles.

O'Ryan is no longer at the church. He was named as a defendant under the theory that he knew in late December 1980 that Roemer was charged with fondling a boy, yet neither he nor the Catholic Church took any precautions to ensure the safety of other children.

A 7-year-old boy and 10-year-old boy were subsequently fondled by Roemer in January 1981, according to court documents.

Attorney Louis Samonsky Jr. of Camarillo filed the lawsuit on behalf of the mothers and their sons. Samonsky said the lawsuit was not filed for three years because it took this long for the mothers to find out the Catholic Church would do nothing in this case.

"The Catholic Church just turned its back on them," Samonsky said.

No one was available at either St. Paschal Baylon Church or

the archdiocese to comment on the lawsuit.

Although the lawsuit seeks no specific amount of damages, it seeks money for medical and psychological treatment of the boys. Samonsky said one boy underwent an extreme personality change because of the molestings.

The lawsuit also seeks punitive damages on the grounds that Roemer acted maliciously in fondling the boys to obtain sexual gratification for himself and the church failed to take steps to curb Roemer, even though it knew or should have known of his tendencies toward pedophilia.

During the criminal proceedings against Roemer, he was interviewed by two psychiatrists. According to court documents, he told Dr. Ronald S. Patterson that his desire to touch children for pleasure went back to the 1970s and this need to touch children got stronger. Roemer also told Patterson that he contacted a clinical psychologist in Santa Barbara, who was also a priest, about his behavior.

In an interview with Dr. Ronald A. Markham, Roemer admitted involvement with more than 20 children dating back to 1970, according to court documents.

✓
REDACTEDM E M O R A N D U M

TO: CARDINAL MANNING
FROM: MONSIGNOR RAWDEN *MR*
DATE: MAY 4, 1984
SUBJ: FATHER REDACTED

Your Eminence:

I telephoned Father ^{REDACTED} today in answer to his letter and suggested he remain in Ireland till such time that ~~this~~ trial was over, because we did not feel it would be good for his health. He readily agreed.

I also indicated he would be receiving a telephone interview from our attorney. When that would take place I was uncertain.

cc: Msgr. Hawkes

REDACTED

6081

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REDACTED
REDACTED

RECEIVED

JUN 07 1984

MORGAN, WENZEL
ATTORNEYS

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF VENTURA

REDACTED

(filed 6-5-84)

Case No. 82750

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT
FOR DAMAGES (Breach of
Contract, Assault and
Battery, Intentional
Infliction of Emotional
Distresses, Negligent
Infliction of Emotional
Distress, Negligent
Employment, Punitive
Damages)

Plaintiffs

VS.

ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP
OF LOS ANGELES, a California
Corporation; ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS
ANGELES, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
CORPORATION, a California
Corporation; PATRICK ROEMER;
FATHER COLM O'RYAN; ST. PASCHAL
BAYLON CATHOLIC CHURCH, an
unincorporated association; and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive.

Defendants.

Plaintiffs complaint of Defendants, and each of

them, and allege:

6024

REDACTED

6/9/84 Send copies to Susan Hunter and

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

1 1. The true names and capacities, whether individual,
2 corporate, associate or otherwise, of Defendants DOES I through
3 50, inclusive, and each of them, are unknown to Plaintiffs, who
4 therefore sue said Defendants by such fictitious names and will
5 seek leave of court to amend this complaint to show their true
6 names and capacities when the same are ascertained. Said
7 Defendants are sued as principals or agents, servants and
8 employees of said principals and all of the acts performed by
9 them were performed within the course and scope of their
10 authority and employment.

11 2. At all times herein mentioned, each of the Defendants
12 was the agent and employee of each of the remaining Defendants,
13 and was acting within the purpose and scope of said agency and
14 employment.

15 3. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant ROMAN
16 CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES (hereinafter "ARCHBISHOP")
17 was and is a California corporation duly organized and existing
18 under the laws of the State of California and authorized to
19 transact and transacting business in the State of California,
20 with its principal place of business in the County of Los
21 Angeles.

22 4. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant ARCHDIOCESE
23 OF LOS ANGELES, EDUCATION AND WELFARE CORPORATION (hereinafter
24 "ARCHDIOCESE"), was and is a corporation duly organized and
25 existing under the laws of the State of California and
26 authorized to transact and transacting business in the State of
27 California, with its principal place of business in the County
28 of Los Angeles.

1 5. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon
2 allege that at all times herein mentioned, Defendant ST. PASCHAL
3 BAYLON CATHOLIC CHURCH (hereinafter "ST. PASCHAL'S") was and is
4 an incorporated association sued herein under the name by which
5 it is known, doing business as a church with its principal
6 office in the City of Thousand Oaks, County of Ventura, State of
7 California.

8 6. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant PATRICK
9 ROEMER (hereinafter "ROEMER") was a priest of the Roman Catholic
10 Church, in charge of children's services at ST. PASCHAL'S, em-
11 ployed by Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST. PASCHAL'S,
12 and each of them, and in doing the acts herein alleged was
13 acting in the course and scope of said employment.

14 7. At all times herein mentioned, FATHER COLM O'RYAN
15 (hereinafter "O'RYAN") was a priest of the Roman Catholic Church
16 employed in a managerial capacity by Defendants ARCHBISHOP,
17 ARCHDIOCESE, and ST. PASCHAL'S, and each of them, and in doing
18 the acts herein alleged was acting in the course and scope of
19 said employment and in his managerial capacity.

20 8. Between 1970 and 1978 in Santa Barbara and Ventura
21 Counties, California, while employed as a priest by Defendants
22 ARCHBISHOP and ARCHDIOCESE, Defendant ROEMER at various and
23 several times informed various counselors, psychologists, and
24 other personnel employed by Defendants ARCHBISHOP and
25 ARCHDIOCESE of Defendant ROEMER's tendencies toward pedophilia
26 and Defendant ROEMER'S prior and continuing sexual molestations
27 of minor children. Defendant ROEMER told said counselors,
28 psychologists, priests and other personnel that said acts of
molestation were performed during the course and scope of

6026

1 Defendant ROEMER's employment. Plaintiffs are informed and
 2 believe and thereon allege that the counselors, psychologists,
 3 priests and other personnel whom Defendant ROEMER informed as
 4 alleged above were officers, directors or managing agents of
 5 Defendant ARCHBISHOP. In continuing to employ Defendant ROEMER
 6 in a position which would put him in contact with children,
 7 after acquiring said knowledge of his unfitness (his above-
 8 described sexual molestation of minors), Defendant ARCHBISHOP
 9 acted in conscious disregard of the rights of safety of others,
 10 including the minor plaintiffs named herein.

11 Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon
 12 allege that said counselors, psychologists and other persons
 13 (officers, directors and managing agents) knew or should have
 14 known that Defendant ROEMER would repeat these acts on minors
 15 with whom he would come in contact during the course and scope
 16 of his employment. Said psychologists, counselors and other
 17 persons are named herein as Defendants DOES I through 20. When
 18 Plaintiffs ascertain the true names of said Defendants, Plain-
 19 tiffs will seek leave to amend this complaint to add said names.

20 9. On or about December 28, 1980, Plaintiff
 21 REDACTED a ST. PASCHAL'S parishoner and parent of a
 22 minor, her son, Plaintiff REDACTED who had been sexually
 23 molested by Defendant ROEMER as alleged with particularity
 24 hereinafter, informed Defendant O'RYAN that her son had been
 25 severely sexually molested by Defendant ROEMER and that such act
 26 was committed during the course and scope of ROEMER'S
 27 employment. Defendant O'RYAN assured Plaintiff REDACTED
 28 REDACTED that the matter would be investigated and remedied.

1 Thereafter, having been notified of Defendant ROEMER'S
 2 molestation of a minor, Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE,
 3 O'RYAN, and ST. PASCHAL's continued to employ Defendant ROEMER
 4 as a priest, and failed to take any precautions to insure the
 5 safety of minor children coming into contact with Defendant
 6 ROEMER. Moreover, said Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE,
 7 O'RYAN and ST. PASCHAL'S continued to employ Defendant ROEMER in
 8 a position at ST. PASCHAL'S, which placed him in charge of
 9 children's services, and encouraged him to use his position of
 10 authority as priest and teacher to lead the children of ST.
 11 PASCHAL'S parishioners in their religious learning at all times
 12 herein mentioned. In so doing, Defendants ARCHBISHOP and ST.
 13 PASCHAL'S ratified the acts of sexual molestation committed by
 14 Defendant ROEMER in the course and scope of his employment.

15
 16 FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

17 REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN
 18 AD LITEM, REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS
 19 (Assault and Battery, Punitive Damages)

20 10. Plaintiff REDACTED (hereinafter REDACTED is a
 21 minor ten (10) years of age. On February 23, 1984, REDACTED
 22 REDACTED Plaintiff's mother, a competent and responsible adult,
 23 was appointed by Order duly given and made by the above-entitled
 24 court, and is now the duly qualified and acting guardian ad
 25 litem of the minor plaintiff in this action.

26 11. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by
 27 reference each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 9 of
 28 this Complaint as though fully set forth.

6028

1 12. On or about January 26, 1981, Plaintiff REDACTED was
2 at Defendant ST. PASCHAL'S for Catholic Christian classes.
3 Defendant ROEMER came outside of his office and asked Plaintiff
4 REDACTED to come inside and look at some pictures. Defendant
5 ROEMER then assaulted and battered Plaintiff REDACTED by lifting
6 REDACTED up and placing REDACTED on Defendant's leg. Defendant ROEMER
7 showed Plaintiff REDACTED some pictures and put his hand under
8 Plaintiff's shirt and rubbed Plaintiff's stomach. Defendant
9 ROEMER then slid his hand down Plaintiff's pants and inside
10 Plaintiff's underpants and rubbed REDACTED penis for several
11 minutes. Defendant also kissed REDACTED on the neck, near the ear,
12 as he was rubbing Plaintiff.

13 13. Each of the aforementioned acts was offensive to
14 REDACTED and by reason of the acts of Defendant ROEMER, Plaintiff
15 was caused to suffer great mental, physical, nervous and
16 emotional pain and suffering. As a result of Plaintiff's
17 injuries, Plaintiff suffered general damages in excess of the
18 jurisdictional minimum of this Court.

19 14. As a further direct and proximate result of the acts
20 of Defendant ROEMER, acting in the course and scope of his
21 employment by Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST.
22 PASCHAL'S, and each of them, Plaintiff has incurred, and in the
23 future will incur further expenses for the services of
24 physicians, nurses, and other medical and health care personnel
25 for medical and incidental treatment. The exact amount of such
26 expenses is unknown to Plaintiff at this time. Leave to amend
27 this Complaint to set forth said sums will be sought when the
28 same have been ascertained.

15. In making the uninvited and unprovoked attack on Plaintiff as heretofore alleged, Defendant ROEMER acted maliciously and was guilty of wanton and conscious disregard of the rights and feelings of Plaintiff, and by reason thereof Plaintiff demands exemplary and punitive damages against Defendants ROEMER, ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST. PASCHAL'S in an amount according to proof.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM
 REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS
 (Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress, Punitive Damages)

16. Plaintiff REDACTED realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations contained in his First Cause of Action, as if set forth fully herein.

17. Defendant ROEMER's conduct was intentional and malicious and done for the purpose of causing Plaintiff REDACTED, to suffer humiliation, mental anguish, and emotional and physical distress, and as a proximate result thereof has been required to and will continue to receive the aid, treatment, counseling and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and physicians, the services of which have caused him to suffer monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

18. As a direct and proximate result of the intentional malicious, extreme and outrageous acts of the Defendants, and each of them, as hereinabove alleged, Plaintiff REDACTED has suffered severe and permanent emotional distress, all to his general damage in a sum within the jurisdiction of this court.

1 19. The conduct of Defendants ROEMER, ARCHBISHOP,
2 ARCHDIOCESE and ST. PASCHAL'S, and each of them, in doing the
3 acts hereinabove alleged was malicious and oppressive and
4 said Defendants were guilty of wanton disregard of the rights
5 and feelings of Plaintiff and by reason thereof, Plaintiff
6 demands exemplary and punitive damages against Defendants in an
7 amount according to proof.

8
9 THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

10 REDACTED , A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM
11 REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

12 (Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress)

13 20. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by this
14 reference each and every allegation contained in his First and
15 Second Causes of Action, as if set forth fully herein.

16 21. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each
17 of them, owed a duty of care to Plaintiff to exercise reasonable
18 care toward Plaintiff while Plaintiff was on the premises of ST.
19 PASCHAL'S and to insure his safety at the church-sponsored
20 above-described Catholic education classes. Defendants, and
21 each of them, breached said duty as previously alleged herein by
22 failing to prevent Defendant ROEMER from performing the acts
23 previously alleged and by failing to provide for the Plaintiff's
24 safety.

25 22. As a direct and proximate result of the negligent
26 conduct by Defendants, and each of them, as herein alleged,
27 Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer severe and
28 permanent mental and emotional distress and as a proximate

6031

1 result thereof, has been required to and will continue to
2 receive the aid, treatment, counseling, and assistance of
3 psychiatrists, psychologists, and physicians, the services of
4 which have caused him to suffer monetary damage in an amount not
5 yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an amendment to this
6 complaint or according to proof.

7 23. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence
8 of Defendants, and each of them, as above alleged, Plaintiff has
9 suffered severe and permanent emotional distress, all to his
10 general damage in a sum within the jurisdictional minimum of
11 this Court.

12
13 FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

14 REDACTED , A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM,
15 REDACTED AGAINST DEFENDANTS ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF
16 LOS ANGELES, ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
17 CORPORATION, FATHER COLM O'RYAN, AND ST. PASCHAL'S
18 (Negligent Employment, Punitive Damages)

19
20 24. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by this
21 reference, each and every allegation contained in his First,
22 Second and Third Causes of Action, as if set forth fully
23 herein.

24 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
25 alleges that Defendants O'RYAN, ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, ST.
26 PASCHAL'S, and DOES 21 through 30, were responsible in some
27 manner for hiring, employing, and placing Defendant ROEMER in
28 his position as an employed priest at ST. PASCHAL'S.

1 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
2 alleges that at all times herein mentioned Defendant ROEMER was
3 in charge of children's services at ST. PASCHAL'S. Plaintiff is
4 further informed and believes and thereon alleges that in said
5 capacity, Defendant ROEMER was encouraged by said Defendants to,
6 and did frequently, come in contact with minor children,
7 including Plaintiff.

8 27. REDACTED is informed and believes and thereon alleges
9 that after Defendants ARCHDIOCESE, ARCHBISHOP, O'RYAN and ST.
10 PASCHAL'S had been notified of Defendant ROEMER's sexual
11 molestation as alleged in paragraphs 8 and 9 above, Defendants
12 ARCHDIOCESE, ARCHBISHOP, O'RYAN and ST. PASCHAL'S knew or should
13 have known that Defendant ROEMER had molested and would continue
14 to molest children with whom he came in contact. Defendants
15 ARCHDIOCESE, ARCHBISHOP, O'RYAN and ST. PASCHAL'S knew or should
16 have known, due to the notice to said Defendants of Defendant
17 ROEMER'S sexual problems, as alleged hereinbefore, that
18 Defendant ROEMER was unfit for the position and capacity in
19 which he was employed.

20 28. In spite of said knowledge, Defendants ARCHBISHOP,
21 ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN and ST. PASCHAL'S negligently continued to
22 employ Defendant ROEMER in said capacity, negligently failed to
23 exercise reasonable care towards the minor Plaintiffs named
24 herein, and negligently failed to warn said minor Plaintiffs,
25 their parents or guardians of Defendant ROEMER'S conduct.

26 29. As a proximate result of said Defendants' negligent
27 employment, failure to warn, and failure to exercise reasonable
28 care as above alleged, Plaintiff came into contact with

1 Defendant ROEMER in the course of ST. PASCHAL'S youth activities
2 program and suffered the injuries as above alleged, which
3 injuries Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN and ST.
4 PASCHAL'S knew, or should have known, would occur.

5 30. As a direct and proximate result of said negligent
6 employment, negligent failure to warn, and negligent failure to
7 exercise reasonable care as above alleged, Plaintiff has
8 suffered and continues to suffer mental and emotional distress
9 and as a proximate result thereof has been required to and will
10 continue to receive the aid, treatment, counseling and
11 assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and physicians, the
12 services of which have caused him to suffer monetary damage in
13 an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an
14 amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

15 31. As a direct and proximate result of said negligent
16 employment, negligent failure to warn and negligent failure to
17 exercise reasonable care as above alleged, by defendants, and
18 each of them, Plaintiff has suffered severe and permanent
19 emotional distress, all to his general damage in a sum within
20 the jurisdiction of this Court.

21 32. The conduct of Defendants, and each of them, as
22 hereinabove alleged, in failing to warn Plaintiff, in failing to
23 exercise reasonable care towards Plaintiff, and in continuing to
24 employ Defendant ROEMER in a position where he was in contact
25 with Plaintiff and other children, was in conscious disregard of
26 the rights of Plaintiff and constituted ratification of
27 Defendant ROEMER'S acts. Plaintiff is thereby entitled to
28 punitive and exemplary damages in a sum to be shown at trial.

6034

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED

A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN

AD LITEM, REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

(Assault and Battery, Punitive Damages)

33. Plaintiff REDACTED (hereinafter REDACTED is a minor, thirteen (13) years of age. On February 23, 1984, REDACTED, Plaintiff's mother, a competent and responsible adult, was appointed by order duly given and made by the above-entitled court, and is now the duly qualified and acting guardian ad litem of the minor Plaintiff in this action.

34. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 9 of this Complaint as though fully set forth.

35. On or about January 19, 1981, while Defendant ROEMER was hearing Plaintiff REDACTED confession on the premises of Defendant ST. PASCHAL'S, Defendant ROEMER assaulted and battered Plaintiff by rubbing his stomach, chest, underarm area, and touching skin under his shirt, while Defendant and Plaintiff were sitting side by side in chairs. During the confession, Defendant also assaulted and battered Plaintiff by kissing him repeatedly on the right ear.

36. Each of the aforementioned acts was offensive to Plaintiff, and by reason of the acts of Defendant ROEMER, Plaintiff was caused to suffer great mental, physical, nervous and emotional pain and suffering. As a result of Plaintiff's injuries, Plaintiff suffered general damages in excess of the jurisdictional minimum of this Court.

6035

38. In making the uninvited and unprovoked attack on Plaintiff as heretofore alleged, Defendant ROEMER acted maliciously and was guilty of wanton and conscious disregard of the rights and feelings of Plaintiff, and by reason thereof Plaintiff demands exemplary and punitive damages against Defendants ROEMER, ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST. PASCHAL'S in an amount according to proof.

REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN
AD LITEM, REDACTED , AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS
(Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress, Punitive Damages)

39. Plaintiff REDACTED realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations contained in the Fifth Cause of Action, as if set forth fully herein.

/

1

6036

1 40. Defendant ROEMER's conduct was intentional and
2 malicious and done for the purpose of causing Plaintiff to
3 suffer humiliation, mental anguish, and emotional and physical
4 distress, and as a proximate result thereof Plaintiff has been
5 and will be required to receive the aid, treatment, counseling
6 and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and physicians,
7 the services of which will cause him to suffer monetary damage
8 in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an
9 amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

10 41. As a direct and proximate result of the intentional,
11 malicious, extreme and outrageous acts of the Defendants, and
12 each of them, as hereinabove alleged, Plaintiff has suffered
13 severe and permanent emotional distress, all to his general
14 damage in a sum within the jurisdiction of this Court.

15 42. The conduct of the Defendants, and each of them, in
16 doing the acts hereinabove alleged was malicious and oppressive
17 and Defendants were guilty of wanton disregard of the rights and
18 feelings of Plaintiff and by reason thereof, Plaintiff demands
19 exemplary and punitive damages against Defendants in an amount
20 according to proof.

21
22 SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

23 REDACTED , A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD
24 LITEM, REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS
25 (Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress)

26 43. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by
27 reference each and every allegation contained in his Fifth and
28 Sixth Causes of Action, as if set forth fully herein.

6037

1 44. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each
2 of them, owed a duty of due care to Plaintiff to exercise
3 reasonable care towards Plaintiff while Plaintiff was on the
4 premises of Defendant ST. PASCHAL'S and while Plaintiff was
5 participating in confession. Defendants, and each of them,
6 breached said duty by failing to prevent Defendant ROEMER from
7 performing the acts previously alleged and by failing to provide
8 for the Plaintiff's safety.

9 45. As a direct and proximate result of the negligent
10 conduct by Defendants, and each of them, as herein alleged,
11 Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer severe and
12 permanent mental and emotional distress and as a proximate
13 result thereof, has been required and will continue to receive
14 the aid, treatment, counseling, and assistance of psychiatrists,
15 psychologists, and physicians, the services of which will cause
16 him to suffer monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained,
17 but which will be shown by an amendment to this complaint or
18 according to proof.

19 46. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence
20 of Defendants, and each of them, as above alleged, Plaintiff has
21 suffered severe and permanent emotional distress all to his
22 general damage in a sum within the jurisdictional minimum of
23 this court.

24 /

25 /

26 /

27 /

28 /

6038

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

1
2 REDACTED, A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN
3 AD LITEM, REDACTED AGAINST DEFENDANTS ROMAN CATHOLIC
4 ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES, ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
5 EDUCATION AND WELFARE CORPORATION, FATHER COLM O'RYAN
6 AND ST. PASCHAL'S

7 (Negligent Employment, Punitive Damages)

8 47. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by this
9 reference all the allegations contained in his Fifth, Sixth,
10 Seventh and Eighth Causes of Action.

11 48. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
12 alleges that Defendants O'RYAN, ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, ST.
13 PASCHAL'S, and DOES 21 through 30 were responsible in some
14 manner for hiring, employing, and placing Defendant ROEMER in
15 his position as an employed priest at ST. PASCHAL'S.

16 49. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
17 alleges that at all times herein mentioned, Defendant ROEMER was
18 in charge of children's services at ST. PASCHAL'S. Plaintiff is
19 further informed and believes and thereon alleges that in said
20 capacity, Defendant ROEMER was encouraged by said Defendants to,
21 and did frequently, come in contact with minor children
22 including Plaintiff.

23 50. REDACTED is informed and believes and thereon alleges
24 that after Defendants ARCHDIOCESE, ARCHBISHOP, O'RYAN and ST.
25 PASCHAL'S had been notified of Defendant ROEMER's sexual
26 molestation as alleged, Defendants ARCHDIOCESE, ARCHBISHOP,
27 O'RYAN and ST. PASCHAL'S knew or should have known that
28 Defendant ROEMER had molested and would continue to molest

6039

1 children with who he came in contact. Defendants ARCHDIOCESE,
2 ARCHBISHOP, O'RYAN, and ST. PASCHAL'S knew or should have known,
3 due to the notice to said Defendants of Defendant ROEMER's sexual
4 problems, as alleged hereinbefore, that Defendant ROEMER was unfit
5 for the position and capacity in which he was employed.

6 51. In spite of said knowledge, Defendants ARCHBISHOP,
7 ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN, and ST. PASCHAL'S negligently continued to
8 employ Defendant ROEMER in said capacity, negligently continued to
9 exercise reasonable care towards the minor Plaintiffs named
10 herein, and negligently failed to warn said minor Plaintiffs,
11 their parents or guardians of defendant ROEMER's conduct.

12 52. As a proximate result of said Defendants' negligent
13 employment of Defendant ROEMER, negligent failure to warn and
14 negligent failure to exercise reasonable care as above alleged,
15 Plaintiff came into contact with Defendant ROEMER in the course of
16 ST. PASCHAL's church program, and suffered the injuries as above
17 alleged, which injuries Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN
18 and ST. PASCHAL'S knew, or should have known, would occur.

19 53. As a direct and proximate result of said failure to
20 warn, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer mental and
21 emotional distress and as a proximate result thereof has been and
22 will be required to receive the aid, treatment, counseling and
23 assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and physicians, the
24 services of which will cause him to suffer monetary damage in an
25 amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an
26 amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

27 /

28 /

6040

55. The conduct of Defendants, and each of them, as hereinabove alleged, in negligently employing Defendant ROEMER, in failing to warn Plaintiff, and in continuing to employ Defendant ROEMER in a position where he came in contact with Plaintiff and other children, was in conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff and constituted ratification of Defendant ROEMER'S acts and thereby entitles Plaintiff to punitive and exemplary damages in a sum to be shown at trial.

REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM,
REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS
(Assault and Battery, Punitive Damages)

56. Plaintiff REDACTED is a minor fifteen (15) years of age. On February 23, 1984, REDACTED Plaintiff's mother, a competent and responsible adult, was appointed by order duly given and made by the above-entitled court, and is now the duly qualified and acting guardian ad litem of the minor Plaintiff in this action.

57. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 8 of this complaint.

1 58. During the summer of 1980, when Plaintiff was twelve
2 (12) years of age, Plaintiff attended a sports camp sponsored by
3 and held at ST. PASCHAL'S from June 16th through June 21st,
4 1980. At various and several times during the course of said
5 camp activities, Defendant ROEMER assaulted and battered
6 Plaintiff by putting his arm around Plaintiff's shoulder,
7 hugging and fondling Plaintiff, and placing Defendant ROEMER's
8 head on Plaintiff's shoulder. Plaintiff attempted to avoid
9 Defendant ROEMER during the periods following said conduct, but
10 Defendant ROEMER repeatedly pursued Plaintiff and said, "You
11 can't get away from me". Defendant ROEMER then came up behind
12 Plaintiff and wrapped his arms around him and put his chin on
13 Plaintiff's shoulder. Plaintiff attempted to get away, but
14 Defendant would not allow him to, and continued to fondle him.
15 After the sports activities were over for one of the
16 above-mentioned days, Plaintiff went to the front of the church
17 to wait for his ride. He was sitting on a bench when Defendant
18 ROEMER came up and sat very close to him, forcing his body to
19 touch Plaintiff's, and Defendant ROEMER put his arm around
20 Plaintiff's shoulder.

21 59. Each of the aforementioned acts was offensive to
22 Plaintiff, and by reason of the acts of Defendant ROEMER,
23 Plaintiff was caused to suffer great mental, physical, nervous
24 and emotional pain and suffering. As a result of Plaintiff's
25 injuries, Plaintiff suffered general damages in excess of the
26 jurisdictional minimum of this Court.

27 60. As a further direct and proximate result of the acts
28 of Defendant ROEMER, acting in the course and scope of his

6042

1 employment by Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST.
 2 PASCHAL'S, and each of them, Plaintiff has incurred and in the
 3 future will incur, expenses for the services of physicians,
 4 nurses and other medical and health care personnel for medical
 5 and incidental treatment. The exact amount of such expenses is
 6 unknown to Plaintiff at this time. Leave to amend this
 7 complaint to set forth said sums will be sought when the same
 8 have been ascertained.

9 61. In making the uninvited and unprovoked attacks on
 10 Plaintiff as heretofore alleged, Defendant ROEMER acted
 11 maliciously and was guilty of wanton and conscious disregard of
 12 the rights and feelings of Plaintiff, and by reason thereof
 13 Plaintiff demands exemplary and punitive damages against
 14 Defendants ROEMER, ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST. PASCHAL'S in
 15 an amount according to proof.

16
 17 TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

18 REDACTED , A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM,
 19 REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS
 20 (Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress, Punitive Damages)
 21

22 62. Plaintiff REDACTED realleges and incorporates by
 23 reference all allegations contained in the Ninth Cause of Action
 24 as if set forth fully herein.

25 63. Defendant ROEMER's conduct was intentional and
 26 malicious and done for the purpose of causing Plaintiff to
 27 suffer humiliation, mental anguish, and emotional and physical
 28 distress, and as a proximate result thereof Plaintiff has been

1 and will be required to receive the aid, treatment, counseling and
 2 assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and physicians, their
 3 services of which will cause him to suffer monetary damage in an
 4 amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an
 5 amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

6 64. As a direct and proximate result of the intentional,
 7 malicious, extreme and outrageous acts of the intentional,
 8 malicious, extreme and outrageous acts of the Defendants, and each
 9 of them, as hereinabove alleged, Plainriff has suffered severe and
 10 permanent emotional distress, all to his general damage in a sum
 11 within the jurisdiction of this Court.

12 65. The conduct of the Defendants, and each of them, in
 13 doing the acts hereinabove alleged was malicious and oppressive
 14 and Defendants were guilty of wanton disregard of the rights and
 15 feelings of Plaintiff and by reason thereof, Plaintiff demands
 16 exemplary and punitive damages against Defendants in an amount
 17 according to proof.

18 ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

19 REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM

20 REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

21 (Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress)

22 66. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by
 23 reference each and every allegation contained in his Ninth and
 24 Tenth Causes of Action.

25 67. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each
 26 of them, owed a duty of due care to Plaintiff to exercise
 27 reasonable care towards Plaintiff while Plaintiff was on the
 28 premises and insure his safety at the church-sponsored sports camp.

1 68. As a direct and proximate result of the negligent
2 conduct by Defendants, and each of them, as herein alleged,
3 Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer severe and
4 permanent mental and emotional distress and as a proximate result
5 thereof, has been required and will continue to receive the aid,
6 treatment, counseling, and assistance of psychiatrists,
7 psychologists, and physicians, the services of which will cause
8 him to suffer monetary damage in a amount not yet ascertained,
9 but which will be shown by an amendment to this complaint or
10 according to proof.

11 69. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence
12 of Defendants, and each of them, as above alleged, Plaintiff has
13 suffered severe and permanent emotional distress all to his
14 general damage in a sum within the jurisdictional minimum of this
15 Court.

16
17 TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
18 REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM
19 REDACTED , AGAINST DEFENDANTS ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF LOS
20 ANGELES, ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
21 CORPORATION, FATHER COLM O'RYAN, AND ST. PASCHAL'S
22 (Negligent Employment, Punitive Damages)
23

24 70. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by this
25 reference, each and every allegation contained in his Ninth,
26 Tenth, and Eleventh Causes of Action.

27 /
28 /

1 71. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
2 alleges that Defendants O'RYAN, ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, ST.
3 PASCHAL'S, and DOES 21 through 30 were responsible in some
4 manner for hiring, employing and placing Defendant ROEMER in his
5 position as an employed priest at ST. PASCHAL'S.

6 72. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
7 alleges that Defendant ROEMER was in charge of children's
8 services at ST. PASCHAL'S. Plaintiff is further informed and
9 believes and thereon alleges that in said capacity, Defendant
10 ROEMER was encouraged by said Defendants to, and did frequently,
11 come in contact with minor children.

12 73. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
13 alleges that prior to placing Defendant ROEMER in said position
14 of employment and after said Defendants were notified of
15 Defendant ROEMER'S sexual molestations of minors as above
16 alleged, Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN, and ST.
17 PASCHAL'S knew or should have known that Defendant ROEMER had
18 molested and would continue to molest minors with whom he came
19 in contact.

20 74. In spite of said knowledge, Defendants ARCHBISHOP,
21 ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN, and ST. PASCHAL'S continued to employ
22 Defendant ROEMER in said capacity, and failed to warn minors or
23 their parents or guardians of Defendant ROEMER'S conduct.

24 75. As a proximate result of said Defendants' negligent
25 employment, failure to warn, and failure to exercise reasonable
26 care as above alleged, Plaintiff came into contact with
27 Defendant ROEMER in the course of ST. PASCHAL'S activities
28 program and suffered the injuries as above alleged, which

1 injuries Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN and ST.
2 PASCHAL'S knew or should have known, would occur.

3 76. As a direct and proximate result of said negligent
4 employment, failure to warn, and failure to exercise reasonable
5 care, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer mental and
6 emotional distress and as a proximate result thereof has been
7 and will be required to receive the aid, treatment, counseling
8 and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and physicians,
9 the services of which will cause him to suffer monetary damage
10 in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an
11 amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

12 77. As a direct and proximate result of said negligent
13 employment, failure to warn, and failure to exercise reasonable
14 care by Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered
15 severe and permanent emotional distress, all to his general
16 damage in a sum within the jurisdiction of this Court.

17 78. The conduct of Defendants, and each of them, as
18 hereinabove alleged, negligently continuing to employ Defendants
19 ROEMER, in failing to warn Plaintiff and in failing to exercise
20 reasonable care towards Plaintiff and in continuing to employ
21 Defendants ROEMER in a position where he came in contact with
22 children was in conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff
23 and thereby entitles Plaintiff to punitive and exemplary damages
24 in a sum to be shown at trial.

25 /

26 /

27 /

28 /

6047

REDACTED , AN INDIVIDUAL, AS AGAINST DEFENDANTS
ST. PASCHAL'S, ARCHBISHOP, AND ARCHDIOCESE
(Breach of Contract)

79. Plaintiff REDACTED realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 8 of this complaint.

80. In April or May of 1980, in Thousand Oaks, California, Plaintiff REDACTED, entered into a written contract with Defendants ST. PASCHAL'S, ARCHBISHOP, and ARCHDIOCESE by the terms of which Plaintiff agreed to pay Defendants valuable consideration for the privileges of having her family, including her son REDACTED, attend a religious family retreat week-end sponsored by said Defendants. Said religious family retreat was held at Camp Yolijsa, in San Bernardino, California, on May 10, and 11, 1980.

81. An implied obligation of said agreement between Plaintiff REDACTED and Defendants ST. PASCHAL'S, ARCHBISHOP and ARCHDIOCESE was that the religious nature of said retreat would be fostered by said Defendants, and that said Defendants would exercise reasonable care in providing a reasonably safe environment for Plaintiff and her family, including her son REDACTED. Further, there existed in said agreement an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing.

82. On or about May 10, or 11, 1980, said Defendants, and each of them, breached the above-referenced obligations when

1 Defendant ROEMER sexually molested Plaintiff's son, REDACTED
2 REDACTED when REDACTED asked Defendant ROEMER to aid him in saying
3 his good-night prayers, as further explained hereinafter.

4 83. Plaintiff REDACTED has performed all
5 conditions, covenants and promises required by her to be
6 performed on her part.

7 84. As a result of Defendant's aforementioned breach of
8 the agreement as alleged, Plaintiff REDACTED has
9 incurred, and in the future will incur liability for expenses for
10 the services of physicians and other medical and health care
11 personnel for medical and incidental treatment to her son,
12 Plaintiff REDACTED who suffered severe mental and emotional
13 distress as a consequential result of Defendant ROEMER'S acts.
14 The exact amount of such expenses is unknown to Plaintiff
15 REDACTED at this time, but is in excess of the
16 jurisdictional minimum of this court and will be shown at trial.

17 85. As a further result of Defendants, and each of their
18 aforementioned breach of the agreement as alleged, Plaintiff
19 REDACTED has suffered mental and emotional distress all
20 to her damage in an amount in excess of the jurisdictional
21 minimum of this Court.

22 /

23 /

24 /

25 /

26 /

27 /

28 /

6049

FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD
LITEM, REDACTED AND REDACTED AN INDIVIDUAL

(Assault and Battery, Punitive Damages)

86. On or about May 10, 1980 at a family retreat sponsored by Defendant ST. PASCHAL'S held at Camp YoliJwa in San Bernardno, California, Plaintiff REDACTED asked Defendant ROEMER to help him say his goodnight prayers. After saying the prayers, Defendant ROEMER, acting in the course and scope of his employment, assaulted and battered Plaintiff REDACTED by reaching down Plaintiff REDACTED pajama bottoms and rubbing Plaintiff's penis while patting plaintiff on the head and talking to Plaintiff about the Church and God. The aforementioned acts were offensive to Plaintiff, and by reason of the acts of Defendant ROEMER, Plaintiff REDACTED was caused to suffer great mental, physical, nervous and emotional pain and suffering. As a result of Plaintiff's injuries, Plaintiff suffered general damages in excess of the jurisdictional minimum of this Court.

87. As a further direct and proximate result of the acts of Defendant ROEMER, acting in the course and scope of his employment by Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST. PASCHAL'S, and each of them, Plaintiff has incurred, and in the future will incur further expenses for the services of physicians, nurses and other medical and health care personnel for medical and incidental treatment. The exact amount of such expenses is unknown to Plaintiff at this time. Leave to amend this complaint to set forth said sums will be sought when the

/

1 same have been ascertained.

2 88. In making the unprovoked attack on Plaintiff REDACTED
3 as heretofore alleged, Defendant ROEMER acted maliciously and
4 was guilty of wanton and conscious disregard of the rights and
5 feelings of Plaintiff REDACTED, and by reason thereof Plaintiff
6 demands exemplary and punitive damages against Defendants
7 ROEMER, ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and ST. PASCHAL'S in an amount
8 to be shown at trial.

9
10 FIFTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

11 REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN
12 AD LITEM, REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS
13 (Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress,
14 Punitive Damages)
15

16 89. Plaintiff REDACTED realleges and incorporates
17 by reference paragraphs 86 through 88 of his Fourteenth Cause of
18 action.

19 90. Defendant ROEMER's conduct was intentional and
20 malicious and done for the purpose of causing Plaintiff to
21 suffer humiliation, mental anguish, and emotional and physical
22 distress, and as a proximate result thereof has been required to
23 and continues to receive the aid, treatment, counseling and
24 assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and physicians, the
25 services of which have caused him to suffer monetary damage in
26 an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an
27 amendment to this complaint or according to proof.
28

1 91. As a direct and proximate result of the intentional,
2 malicious, extreme and outrageous acts of the Defendants, and
3 each of them, as hereinabove alleged, Plaintiff has suffered
4 severe and permanent emotional distress, all to his general
5 damage in a sum within the jurisdiction of this court.

6 92. The conduct of the Defendants, and each of them, in
7 doing the acts hereinabove alleged was malicious and oppressive
8 and Defendants were guilty of wanton disregard of the rights and
9 feelings of Plaintiff and by reason thereof, Plaintiff demands
10 exemplary and punitive damages against Defendants in an amount
11 according to proof.

12
13 SIXTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

14 REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN
15 AD LITEM, REDACTED AGAINST ALL DEFENDNTS
16 (Negligent Inflation of Emotional Distress)

17
18 93. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by
19 reference each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 86
20 through 88 of his Fourteenth Cause of Action and each and every
21 allegation contained in his Fifteenth Cause of Action, as if set
22 forth fully herein.

23 94. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each
24 of them, owed a duty of due care to Plaintiff to exercise
25 reasonable care toward him and to insure his safety at the
26 church-sponsored camp. Defendants, and each of them, breached
27 said duties by failing to prevent Defendant ROEMER from
28 performing the acts previously alleged and by failing to provide

1 for the Plaintiff's safety.

2 95. As a direct and proximate result of the above
3 alleged conduct of Defendants and each of them, Plaintiff
4 sustained great emotional disturbance and shock and injury to his
5 nervous system, all of which has caused and continues to cause,
6 and will cause him great physical and mental pain and suffering,
7 all to his damage in an amount in excess of the jurisdictional
8 minimum of this court. As a direct and proximate result of the
9 negligent conduct as above alleged by Defendants, and each of
10 them, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer mental and
11 emotional distress and as a proximate result thereof, has been
12 required to and continues to receive the aid, treatment,
13 counseling and assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and
14 physicians, the services of which have caused him to suffer
15 monetary damage in an amount not yet ascertained, but which will
16 be shown by an amendment to this complaint or according to
17 proof.

18 96. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence
19 of Defendants, and each of them, as above alleged, Plaintiff has
20 suffered severe and permanent emotional distress all to his
21 general damage in a sum within the jurisdictional minimum of this
22 Court.

23 /

24 /

25 /

26 /

27 /

28 /

6053

SEVENTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REDACTED A MINOR, BY AND THROUGH HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM,
REDACTED AGAINST DEFENDANTS ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE,
O'RYAN, AND ST. PASCHAL'S
(Negligent Employment, Punitive Damages)

97. Plaintiff REDACTED realleges and incorporates herein this reference each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 86 through 88, inclusive, of his Fourteenth Cause of Action and each and every allegation contained in his Fifteenth and Sixteenth Causes of Action, as if set forth fully herein.

98. Plaintiff REDACTED is informed and believes and thereon alleges that all times herein mentioned, Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN, and DOES 21 through 30 were responsible in some manner in hiring, employing and placing Defendant ROEMER in his position as an employed priest at ST. PASCHAL'S.

99. Plaintiff REDACTED is informed and believes and thereon alleges that all times herein mentioned Defendant ROEMER was in charge of children's services at ST. PASCHAL'S. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that in said capacity, Defendant ROEMER was encouraged to and did frequently come in contact with minor children.

100. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that prior to placing Defendant ROEMER in said position of employment as above-described, Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN and ST. PASCHAL'S knew or should have known that Defendant ROEMER had sexually molested and would continue to molest minors with whom he came in contact.

1 101. In spite of said knowledge, Defendants ARCHBISHOP,
2 ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN and ST. PASCHAL'S continued to employ
3 Defendants ROEMER in said capacity, and failed to warn minors or
4 their parents or guardians of Defendant ROEMER'S conduct.

5 102. As a proximate result of said Defendants'
6 employment of Defendant ROEMER, and ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE,
7 O'RYAN and ST. PASCHAL'S failure to warn as above-alleged,
8 Plaintiff REDACTED came into contact with Defendant ROEMER and
9 suffered the injuries as above alleged, which injuries
10 Defendants ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, O'RYAN, and ST. PASCHAL'S
11 knew or should hve known would occur.

12 103. As a direct and proximate result of said negligent
13 employment and of said failure to warn by Defendants, Plaintiff
14 has suffered and continues to suffer mental and emotional
15 disress and as a proximate result thereof has been required to
16 and continues to receive the aid, treatment, counseling and
17 assistance of psychiatrists, psychologists and physicians, the
18 services of which have caused him to suffer monetary damage in
19 an amount not yet ascertained, but which will be shown by an
20 amendment to this complaint or according to proof.

21 104. As a direct and proximate result of said negligent
22 employment and failure to warn by Defendants, and each of them,
23 Plaintiff has suffered severe and permanent emotional distress,
24 all to his general damage in a sum within the jurisdiction of
25 this Court.

26 105. The conduct of Defendants, and each of them, as
27 hereinabove alleged, in continuing to employ Defendant ROEMER
28 and in failing to warn Plaintiff or his parents or guardians was

6055

1 in conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff and thereby
2 entitles Plaintiff to punitive and exemplary damages in a sum to
3 be shown at trial.

4
5 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray judgment as follows:

6 AS TO PLAINTIFFS REDACTED

7 REDACTED

8 ON ALL CAUSES OF ACTION:

9 1. For general damages in a sum within the jurisdiction
10 of this court;

11 2. For medical, psychiatric and other health care
12 expenses according to proof;

13 3. For exemplary and punitive damages in a sum according
14 to proof.

15 4. For prejudgment interest;

16 5. for costs of suit herein incurred;

17 6. for such other and further relief as this court deems
18 just and proper.

19 AS TO PLAINTIFF REDACTED

20 ON THE THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

21 1. For consequential damages according to proof;

22 2. For damages for emotional distress according to
23 proof;

24 /

25 /

26 /

27 /

28 /

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

3. For costs of suit herein incurred;

4. For such other and further relief as this court deems
just and proper.

DATED: June 4, 1984

REDACTED
REDACTED

/

6057

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss
COUNTY OF VENTURA)

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within entitled action. My business address is 340 Rosewood Avenue, Suite "0," Camarillo, California 93010.

On June 5, 1984, I served the within _____
FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES (Breach of Contract, Assault and Battery, Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distresses, Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress, Negligent Employment, Punitive Damages

on the Attorneys for Defendant _____ in said action by placing a ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Camarillo, California, addressed as follows:

REDACTED

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on June 5, 1984 at Camarillo, California.

REDACTED

1 REDACTED

FILED

AUG -9 1984

RICHARD D. DEAN, County Clerk

By Deputy County Clerk

Attorneys for Defendant, ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES,
a corporation sole

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF VENTURA

RECEIVED

AUG 14 1984

11 REDACTED

MORGAN, WENZEL
McNICHOLAS

Case No. 82750

DATE: September 5, 1984
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
DEPT: 41

ON CALENDAR

17 Plaintiffs,

18 v.

19 ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF LOS
20 ANGELES, a California Corporation;
21 ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES,
22 EDUCATION AND WELFARE CORPORATION,
23 a California Corporation; PATRICK
24 ROEMER; FATHER COLM O'RYAN; ST.
25 PASCHAL BAYLON CATHOLIC CHURCH, an
26 unincorporated association; and
27 DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

28 Defendants.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT
OF DEMURRER AND MOTION
TO STRIKE ON BEHALF OF
ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP
OF LOS ANGELES, A
CORPORATION SOLE, TO
PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED
COMPLAINT

(Demurrer and Motion to
Strike Filed Concurrently
Herewith)

///

///

5976

8/17/84 To "Judge" file

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1		
2		
3		
4	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED.....	11
5		
6	A. Introduction.....	2
7	B. Authority for Demurrer and	
8	Motion to Strike.....	4
9		
10	I. ALMA W. CLEARLY STANDS FOR THE	
11	PROPOSITION THAT REGARDLESS OF THE	
12	WORK A PRIEST OR CLERGYMAN PERFORMS,	
13	EVEN IF IT IS RELATED TO "CHILDREN'S	
14	SERVICES," SEXUAL MISCONDUCT IS ALWAYS	
15	BEYOND THE COURSE AND SCOPE OF HIS	
16	CLERICAL DUTIES.....	5
17		
18	II. THE CLAIMS OF PLAINTIFF ^{REDACTED}	
19	REDACTED FOR MENTAL AND EMOTIONAL	
20	DISTRESS ARE TIME BARRED AND	
21	OTHERWISE NOT COGNIZABLE UNDER	
22	THE LAW.....	15
23		
24	A. Code of Civil Procedure,	
25	Section 340(3), Bars the	
26	Claim of REDACTED	
27	for Emotional Distress.....	15
28		
29	B. The Law Does Not Permit	
30	Recovery of Damages for	
31	Physical Harm or Emotional	
32	Distress Caused by the	
33	Knowledge of an Injury to	
34	Another Person.....	21
35		
36	III. THE COMPLAINT FAILS TO STATE A CAUSE	
37	OF ACTION FOR PUNITIVE DAMAGES AS	
38	AGAINST THE DEFENDANT ARCHBISHOP.....	26
39		
40	Conclusion.....	37

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

<u>Cases:</u>	<u>Page</u>
<u>Allen v. National Peanut Corporation</u> (1947) 75 N.E.2d 240.....	14
<u>Alma W. v. Oakland Unified School District</u> (1981) 123 Cal.App.2d 133, 176 Cal.Rptr. 287.....	5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 37
<u>Baker v. Peck</u> (1934) 1 Cal.App.2d 231, 36 P. 2d 404.....	34
<u>Barlett v. Jackson</u> (1936) 13 Cal.App.2d 435, 437.....	31
<u>Barr Lumber Company v. Shaffer</u> (1951) 108 Cal.App.2d 4, 23.....	4
<u>Becker v. Volkswagen of America</u> (1975) 52 Cal.App.3d 794, 125 Cal.Rptr. 326.....	19
<u>Bernstein v. Piller</u> (1950) 98 Cal.App.2d 441, 443-444.....	5
<u>Brousseau v. Jarrett</u> (1977) 73 Cal.App.3d 864, 141 Cal.Rptr. 200.....	36
<u>Burke v. Superior Court</u> (1969) 71 Cal.2d 276, 279.....	30
<u>Capelouto v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals</u> (1982) 7 Cal.3d 889, 892-893; 103 Cal.Rptr. 856.....	20
<u>Carini v. Beaven</u> (Mass. 1914) 106 N.E. 589.....	13, 14
<u>City of Green Cove Springs v. Donaldson</u> (5th Cir. 1965) 348 F.2d 197.....	14
<u>Clack v. State of California</u> (1969) 275 Cal. App.2d 743, 749.....	31
<u>Daar v. Yellow Cab Co.</u> (1967) 67 Cal.2d 695.....	30
<u>Dillon v. Legg</u> (1968) 68 Cal.2d 728.....	21, 22, 23, 24, 37
<u>Ebaugh v. Rabkin</u> (1972) 22 Cal.App.3d 891.....	33
<u>Gombos v. Ashe</u> (1958) 158 Cal.App.2d 517.....	32

1	<u>Gray v. Reeves</u> (1977) 76 Cal.App.3d 567,	
2	576, 142 Cal.Rptr. 716.....	20
3	<u>Groff v. DuBois</u> (1922) 57 Cal.App. 343,	
4	207 P.57.....	17
5	<u>Hair v. Monterey</u> (1975) 45 Cal.App.3d	
6	538, 543; 119 Cal.Rptr. 639.....	24
7	<u>Hancock v. Burns</u> (1958) 158 Cal.App.2d 785.....	31
8	<u>Huntly v. Zurich</u> (1929) 100 Cal.App. 201, 212,	
9	280 P. 163.....	17
10	<u>Jansen v. Children's Hosp.</u> (1973) 31 Cal.App.3d	
11	22, 106 Cal.Rptr. 883.....	23, 24
12	<u>Jones v. Oxnard School Dist.</u> (1969) 270 Cal.	
13	App.2d 587, 592.....	31
14	<u>Justus v. Atchison</u> (1977) 19 Cal.3d 564,	
15	139 Cal.Rptr. 97.....	24, 25
16	<u>Kraner v. Halsey</u> (1989) 82 C. 209, 212.....	5
17	<u>Krouse v. Graham</u> (1977) 19 Cal.3d 59,	
18	137 Cal.Rptr. 863.....	22
19	<u>Krug v. Meeham</u> (1952) 109 Cal.App.2d 274.....	30
20	<u>Lambert v. Southern Countries Gas Co.</u> (1959)	
21	52 C.2d 347, 352).....	4
22	<u>Magnuson v. O'Dea</u> (Wash. 1913) 135 Pac. 640.....	12, 13
23	<u>Nicholas v. Smith</u> (1934) 136 Cal.App.272,	
24	276-277.....	31
25	<u>Powers v. Sissoev</u> (1974) 39 Cal.App.3d	
26	865, 874; 114 Cal.Rptr. 868.....	24
27	<u>Priola v. Pauling</u> (1977) 72 Cal.App.3d 380,	
28	383, 140 Cal.Rptr. 186.....	19
29	<u>Pritchard v. Sharp</u> (1974) 41 Cal.App.3d	
30	530, 531, 116 Cal.Rptr. 9.....	19
31	<u>Richardson v. Employer's Liab. Assur. Corp.</u>	
32	(1972) 25 Cal.App.3d 232, 246.....	35
33	<u>Roth v. Shell Oil Co.</u> (1960) 185 Cal.App.2d 676,	
34	8 Cal.Rptr. 514.....	35

1	<u>Searle & Co. (G.D.) v. Superior Court</u> (1975)	
2	49 Cal.App.3d 22, 25, 122 Cal.Rptr. 218.....	18, 35, 36
3	<u>Serrano v. Priest</u> (1971) 5 Cal.3d 584.....	30
4	<u>Sevilla v. Sterns-Rogers</u> (1980) 101 Cal.App.3d	
5	608, 610, 161 Cal.Rptr. 700.....	18
6	<u>Taylor v. Superior Court</u> (1979) 24 Cal.3d	
7	890, 157 Cal.Rptr. 693.....	32
8	<u>Wilson v. Sharp</u> (1954) 42, C.2d 675, 677.....	4
9	<u>Wise v. Southern Pacific Co.</u> (1963) 223	
10	Cal.App.2d 50.....	30
11	<u>Wynne v. Orcutt Union School Dist.</u> (1971)	
12	17 Cal.App.3d 1108; 95 Cal.Rptr. 458.....	23

STATUTES

California Code of Civil Procedure

15	Section 337.1.....	18
16	Section 337.15.....	18
17	Section 340(3).....	15, 16, 17,
18		20, 37
19	Section 430.10(a).....	5
20	Section 430.10(e).....	4
21	Section 430.10(f).....	4

California Civil Code

22	Section 3294.....	28
23	Section 3294(c)(2).....	35
24	Uniform Commercial Code 2725 (text, §293).....	19
25	BAJI No. 12.83.....	21
26	BAJI No. 12.84.....	23

TREATISES

27	2 Witkin, Cal. Procedure (2d ed. 1970)	
28	Actions, §309, p.1153.....	17, 20
	2 Witkin, Cal. Procedure (2d ed. 1983 Supp.)	
	Trial, §309, pp.142-143.....	16, 20

1 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

2 A. Introduction

3
4 Plaintiffs' first amended complaint totally misses
5 the point which was made and sustained by this Court at
6 the time of defendant's demurrer to plaintiffs' original
7 complaint.

8
9 The demurrer was sustained because the plaintiff
10 failed to allege with legal sufficiency that defendant
11 Roman Catholic Archbishop could be held vicariously liable
12 for the sexual misconduct of its priests, in this case the
13 defendant Patrick Roemer. In plaintiff's original complaint
14 the plaintiffs alleged the following:

15
16 1. On page 3, paragraph 6, that "defendant "Patrick
17 Roemer was a priest of the Roman Catholic Church employed
18 by defendants' Archbishop, Archdiocese, and St. Paschel's,
19 and each of them, and in doing the acts herein alleged
20 was acting in the course and scope of said employment."

21
22 2. On page 3, paragraph 7, " . . . and in doing
23 the acts herein alleged was acting in the course and
24 scope of said employment and in his managerial capacity."

25
26 3. On page 3, paragraph 8, " . . . his prior sexual
27 molestations of minor children, some of which were performed
28 during the course and scope of defendant Romer's employment."

1 4. Plaintiff further alleges that all other sexual
2 acts were within "course and scope" at page 4, paragraph
3 9; at page 6, paragraph 14; at page 14, paragraph 37; at
4 page 20, paragraph 60; at page 27, paragraph 86; at page
5 27, paragraph 87.

6
7 Now the plaintiffs have filed a first amended
8 complaint which alleges nothing new in this regard.
9 Plaintiffs simply repeat the conclusion and allegation
10 that defendant Roemer acted in the "course and scope" and
11 then plaintiffs have thrown in for good measure that:

12
13 "Defendant Patrick Roemer . . . was a
14 priest of the Roman Catholic Church,
15 in charge of children's services at
16 St. Paschel's, . . . and in doing the
17 acts herein alleged was acting in the
18 course and scope of said employment."
19 (Page 3, paragraph 6.)

20
21 and that:

22 "Defendant Roemer told said counselors,
23 psychologists, priests and other personnel
24 that said acts of molestation were performed
25 during the course and scope of said defendant
26 Roemer's employment." (Page 3, paragraph 8.)
27 (The underscored is all that is new in
28 plaintiffs' allegations.)

1 These changes do not cure the defects of the previous
2 complaint. There are only changes in style and format,
3 but not substance.

4
5
6 B. Authority for Demurrer and Motion to Strike
7

8 A defendant may demurrer to a complaint when it
9 appears on the face of the complaint that the pleading
10 does not state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of
11 action. (Code of Civil Procedure, §430.10(e).)
12

13 A complaint must state facts constituting a complete
14 cause of action without the aid of conjectured facts not
15 stated. (Lambert v. Southern Counties Gas Co. (1959) 52
16 C.2d 347, 352.)
17

18 If a pleading is not only insufficient, but it is
19 evident that it cannot be made sufficient, a demurrer
20 without leave to amend may be employed. (Wilson v. Sharp
21 (1954) 42 C.2d 675, 677; Barr Lumber Company v. Shaffer
22 (1951) 108 Cal.App.2d 4, 23.)
23

24 A defendant may also demurrer to a complaint when it
25 appears from the face thereof that the complaint is
26 uncertain. (Code of Civil Procedure, §430.10(f).)
27

28 ///

5983

1 Every statement of fact in a complaint must be direct
2 and certain and not by way of inference, or a demurrer to
3 the complaint for uncertainty will lie. (Kraner v. Halsey
4 (1889) 82 C. 209, 212; Bernstein v. Piller (1950) 98
5 Cal.App.2d 441, 443-444.)
6

7 A defendant may also demurrer to a complaint where
8 it appears from the face thereof that there is a defect
9 or misjoinder of parties. (Code of Civil Procedure,
10 §430.10(a).)
11
12

13 I. ALMA W. CLEARLY STANDS FOR THE PROPOSITION THAT
14 REGARDLESS OF THE WORK A PRIEST OR CLERGYMAN PERFORMS,
15 EVEN IF IT IS RELATED TO "CHILDREN'S SERVICES,"
16 SEXUAL MISCONDUCT IS ALWAYS BEYOND
17 THE COURSE AND SCOPE OF HIS CLERICAL DUTIES.
18

19 Consequently, Alma W. demands that as a matter of
20 law, when Fr. Roemer began molesting said plaintiffs he
21 was removed from the course and scope of his clerical
22 duties because his wrongful action has become so attenuated
23 that the law will not hold the defendant, the Roman
24 Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles, a corporation sole
25 ("Archbishop"), vicariously liable. Further, in the
26 instant case, not only are Fr. Roemer's acts so "attenuated"
27 that the law flatly refuses to impose liability, but defendant
28 Fr. Roemer's actions are in no way pursuant to his occupational

1 duties as a priest; in fact, his conduct is totally
2 contradictory to the purpose of his clerical duties.
3 Sexual molestation bears no relation to the performance
4 of one's duties as a spiritual counselor and clearly is
5 not, in the words of Alma W., "in pursuit of the occupational
6 duties" designed for a priest in performing his role as a
7 spiritual guide for the young, -- which is precisely why
8 plaintiffs have filed suit. If "sexual molestation is in
9 no way related to mopping floors, cleaning rooms, . . . "
10 then it certainly is not related to spiritual guidance by
11 a priest or clergyman.

12

13 1. With regard to plaintiff, REDACTED the defendant
14 Roemer is alleged to have lifted plaintiff REDACTED up
15 and placed him on his leg and put his hand under his shirt
16 and rubbed his stomach. Defendant Roemer then slid his
17 hand down REDACTED pants and inside his underpants
18 and rubbed his penis for several minutes. Defendant
19 Roemer also kissed REDACTED on the neck, near the
20 ear, as he was rubbing him.

21

22 2. With regard to plaintiff REDACTED, the
23 defendant Roemer is alleged to have rubbed his stomach,
24 chest, underarm area, touched skin under his shirt and
25 kissed him repeatedly on the right ear.

26

27 3. With regard to plaintiff REDACTED the defendant
28 Roemer is alleged to have put his arm around REDACTED shoulder,

1 hugged and fondled him, placed his head on REDACTED
2 shoulder, and, later defendant Roemer came up behind and
3 wrapped his arms around him and put his chin on REDACTED
4 shoulder and continued to fondle him. REDACTED was sitting on
5 a bench when defendant Roemer came up and sat very close to
6 him, forcing his body to touch REDACTED and Roemer put his
7 arm around his shoulder.

8
9 4. With regard to plaintiff REDACTED the defendant
10 Roemer is alleged to have sexually molested REDACTED
11 as REDACTED asked defendant Roemer to aid him in saying his
12 good-night prayers by reaching down REDACTED pajama bottoms
13 and rubbing his penis.

14
15 Any sexual act such as described above is not within
16 the course and scope of the duties of the defendant priest
17 as a matter of law. The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los
18 Angeles is not liable to plaintiffs and may not be held
19 liable to plaintiffs under the doctrine of respondeat
20 superior by reason of any of the acts of sexual misconduct
21 alleged in plaintiffs' first amended complaint to have been
22 committed by the defendant Patrick Roemer, a Roman Catholic
23 priest:

24
25 This course and scope issue is controlled by Alma W.
26 v. Oakland Unified School District (1981) 123 Cal.App.3d
27 133, 176 Cal.Rptr. 287. The plaintiff in that case was
28

1 an 11-year old student at one of the District's schools
2 who alleged that she had been sexually molested and raped
3 by a school district custodian in the custodian's office
4 on the school's premises on a Friday afternoon. She
5 joined the school district as a defendant on the theory
6 of respondeat superior. The District interposed a general
7 demurrer which was sustained by the trial court and judgment
8 thereon entered in favor of the District. The Court of
9 Appeals affirmed on the ground that the acts of the custodian
10 in raping and molesting the appellant as a matter of law
11 could not be within the course and scope of employment, and
12 therefore there was no basis to impose liability on the
13 District.

14

15 In a well-reasoned and exhaustive opinion the Alma
16 W. court held that an employer is not liable for the
17 sexual misconduct of an employee, even though the offenses
18 took place on the employer's property during working
19 hours:

20

21

22 "This case presents us with a factual
23 situation where the connection between
24 the employee's duties and the employee's
25 wrongful action has become so attenuated
26 that the law will not hold the employer
27 vicariously liable. Sexual molestation
28 is in no way related to mopping floors,

1 cleaning rooms, or any other tasks that
2 are required of a school custodian. . . .

3
4 "Where an employee pursues his own
5 ends, the use of property or facilities
6 entrusted to him by the principal is an
7 inadequate basis for imputing liability
8 to the employer. . . .

9
10 "Nor does the fact that the offense
11 occurred during working hours make
12 Bell's actions incidental to his
13 employment . . . If an employee's tort
14 is personal in nature, mere presence at
15 the place of employment and attendance
16 to occupational duties prior or subsequent
17 to the offense will not give rise to a
18 cause of action against the employer
19 under the doctrine of respondeat
20 superior." (123 C.A.3d 139-140.)

21
22
23 The court in Alma W. v. Oakland Unified School District
24 also rejected appellant's argument that liability should be
25 imposed on the employer District as a means of spreading
26 the risk to the community at large:

27
28 ///

1 "Distilled to its essence, appellant's
2 argument is little more than that the risk
3 of loss from an employee's sexual assault
4 should fall on the school district as a
5 means of spreading the risk to the
6 community at large. Appellant is
7 leaning on a slender reed. The 'spread
8 the risk' concept underlying the
9 doctrine of respondeat superior does
10 not mean that attribution of liability
11 to an employer is merely a legal artifice
12 invoked to reach a deep pocket or that
13 it is based on an elaborate theory of
14 optimal resource allocation (citation).
15 Rather, the concept of spreading the
16 risk is simply another way of saying
17 that an enterprise should be charged
18 with the cost of those accidents directly
19 attributable to its activities.
20 (Citations) . . . We invoke the
21 doctrine of respondeat superior to
22 indemnify only those losses which as a
23 practical matter are sure to occur in
24 the conduct of the employer's business.
25 A sexual assault simply does not fall
26 within the range of risks allocable to
27 an employer." (123 Cal.App.3d at 143-144.)
28

1 That Alma W. v. Oakland Unified School District involved
2 a public entity does not detract from its applicability to
3 the Archbishop because the common law rule and the rule for
4 California governmental entities with respect to respondeat
5 superior liability is the same:

6
7
8 "The general rule of respondeat superior
9 at common law for non-governmental
10 employers is the same as that set forth
11 in the Government Code for public
12 employers: an employer is vicariously
13 liable for the torts of employees
14 committed within the course and scope
15 of their employment." (123 Cal.App.3d
16 at 138-139.)

17
18
19 Any claim that Alma W. should not apply in favor of
20 defendant Archbishop because a Catholic priest occupies a
21 different relationship to a church member such as the
22 plaintiffs than a custodian does to a student should be
23 rejected out of hand because the rationale of Alma W. is
24 that an employee's sexual misconduct is simply beyond the
25 course and scope of employment, and is not based on the
26 nature of the particular position held by the offending
27 employee. The fact that the individual defendant is
28 alleged to be a priest and the employee in Alma W. was a

1 custodian should not preclude the applicability of the
2 holding in Alma W. to the present situation, with the result
3 that the Archbishop is not liable for the acts of the
4 defendant priest.

5
6 Thus, under Alma W. v. Oakland Unified School District
7 the Archbishop may not be held liable for the acts of the
8 defendant priest consisting of any of the following: (1)
9 molesting the minor plaintiffs; or, (2) any other act or
10 conduct of a sexual nature committed between defendant
11 priest and plaintiffs. The Archbishop is therefore
12 entitled a ruling of this Court that the Archbishop may
13 not be held liable to the plaintiffs under the doctrine
14 of respondeat superior or any other agency theory for any
15 of the acts enumerated in the foregoing notice of demurrer
16 and motion or any other act or conduct of a sexual nature
17 by the defendant priest. The Archbishop is entitled to
18 have the demurrers sustained without leave to amend.

19
20 Other jurisdictions have reached the same result as
21 Alma W. on the same reasoning.

22
23 In Magnuson v. O'Dea (Wash. 1913) 135 Pac. 640, a
24 young girl between 16 and 18 years old was kidnapped. The
25 case was dismissed as to certain defendant corporations and
26 as to O'Dea as bishop of the Diocese of Seattle but retained
27 as to him and all other defendants in their private capacities.
28 The jury verdicts for several plaintiffs, one of which was

1 against Bishop O'Dea as an individual, were reversed.

2

3 In Magnuson the plaintiff's daughter attended a Catholic
4 academy in Tacoma conducted by the Sisters of Visitation.
5 The Sisters, the rector of St. Leo's Church and an attorney
6 were Bishop O'Dea's co-defendants.

7

8 The alleged kidnapping occurred when the plaintiff
9 mother took her daughter from the school to Seattle; during
10 the evening the daughter ran away and returned to the
11 Rectory at Tacoma. The rector took her to the home of the
12 co-defendant attorney where she stayed for about three
13 months. She was then returned to her mother.

14

15 The Washington Supreme Court stated that the trial
16 court erred in denying Bishop O'Dea's motion for a directed
17 verdict and for a judgment non obstante veredicto.

18

19 The plaintiff's judgment was reversed with directions
20 to enter judgment for Bishop O'Dea and to grant a new trial
21 as to the other individual defendants.

22

23 In Carini v. Beaven (Mass. 1914) 106 N.E. 589, it was
24 alleged that a parish priest dragged an 18 year old girl
25 from a church service into the vestry where he allegedly
26 raped her. As a result she gave birth to a child. The
27 demurrer of the defendant bishop (Beaven) was sustained
28 without leave to amend and affirmed on appeal.

1 In Allen v. National Peanut Corporation (1947) 75
2 N.E.2d 240, defendant's motion for nonsuit was granted
3 upon plaintiff's opening statement and was affirmed on appeal.
4 In Allen the plaintiff, a girl 15 years old, was hired to
5 work in one of defendant's stores by Pelosi, the store
6 manager. One evening Pelosi raped the 15 year old plaintiff
7 in the rear room of the store. Previously Pelosi had been
8 convicted of lewdness and of neglect to support his illegitimate
9 child. The Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts held
10 "Moreover even if the defendant employer had known all the
11 facts, it might have had reason to anticipate attempts at
12 seduction on his part, but not a crime of violence like
13 rape. [Citations.] Of course such a crime had no connection
14 with his employment. [Citations.] The case is governed by
15 Carini v. Roman Catholic Bishop of Springfield, 219 Mass.
16 117, 106 N.E. 589, LRA 1915B, 825." (Emphasis added.)
17

18 Other jurisdictions have reached the same result as
19 Alma W. but on different reasoning. In City of Green Cove
20 Springs v. Donaldson (5th Cir. 1965) 348 F.2d 197, a citizen
21 sued the City of Green Cove Springs as a result of one of
22 its police officer's assault and rape. The judgment of
23 the trial court for the citizen was reversed by the Fifth
24 Circuit which held that plaintiff's injury, due to assault
25 and rape by the officer, was not the proximate cause of
26 negligence of the city but resulted instead from an
27 intervening independent and unforeseeable act.
28

1 It therefore seems abundantly clear that each of the
2 demurrers of the defendant Archbishop are well taken and
3 should be sustained without leave to amend as to each of
4 the causes of action for the reasons stated in each of the
5 cases above, especially Alma W. v. Oakland Unified
6 School District (1981) 123 Cal.App.3d 133.

7
8
9 II. THE CLAIMS OF PLAINTIFF REDACTED FOR MENTAL
10 AND EMOTIONAL DISTRESS ARE TIME BARRED AND
11 OTHERWISE NOT COGNIZABLE UNDER THE LAW.

12
13 It is also again the position of the defendant Archbishop
14 that in addition to the reasons set out in Point I: (1)
15 that the statute of limitations (Code of Civil Procedure,
16 section 340(3) bars the claim of REDACTED for
17 personal injuries; and (2) that her claims for emotional
18 distress are not legally cognizable under the allegations
19 in the first amended complaint.

20
21
22 A. Code of Civil Procedure, Section 340(3),
23 Bars the claim of REDACTED
24 for Emotional Distress
25

26 In paragraph 82 in the thirteenth cause of action on
27 page 25 plaintiff REDACTED alleges that "on or
28 about May 10 or 11, 1980," her son, REDACTED was sexually

1 molested; in paragraph 85 she alleges that as a result
2 she "has suffered mental and emotional distress all to
3 her damage in an amount in excess of the jurisdictional
4 minimum of this Court." The original complaint was not
5 filed until February 23, 1984. Therefore, more than one
6 year has elapsed since her cause of action allegedly arose.
7 In fact, prior to filing of the original complaint, three
8 years, eight months and forty-four days had elapsed since
9 her alleged cause of action arose.

10
11 Therefore, section 340(3), Code of Civil Procedure
12 bars the claim of REDACTED for emotional distress.
13 As will be further seen below, the claim of REDACTED
14 REDACTED for mental and emotional distress is barred by
15 the one-year statute of limitations, Code of Civil Procedure
16 §340(3).

17
18 Damages for emotional distress, mental anguish,
19 humiliation and embarrassment are controlled by Section
20 340(3), Code of Civil Procedure, which provides:

21
22
23 "An action . . . for injury . . . caused
24 by the wrongful act or neglect of another
25 . . . " must be brought within one (1) year.

26
27
28 ///

5995

1 According to Witkin (2 Witkin, Cal. Procedure (2d ed.
2 1970) Actions, §309, p.1153, and, 2 Witkin, Cal. Procedure
3 (2d ed. 1983 Supp.) Trial, §309, pp.142-143:

4
5 "Section §340(3) covers personal injuries of every
6 kind, regardless of the nature of the wrongful act:

7
8 "(a) It applies to the typical action for damages
9 suffered from a negligent act.

10
11 "(b) It also applies to an action for personal injuries
12 suffered from an intentional tort. (See Groff v. DuBois
13 (1922) 57 Cal.App.343, 207 P. 57 [injuries from malicious
14 attempt to evict from premises].)

15
16 "(c) It applies to an action for damages suffered from
17 emotional distress. (Emphasis added.) In Huntly v. Zurich
18 (1929) 100 Cal.App.201, 212, 280 P. 163, a widow's action
19 against defendants who allegedly performed an unlawful
20 autopsy on her deceased husband's body, the court said:

21
22
23 'There need be no physical contact with
24 the body of a person to constitute a
25 cause of action for personal injury.
26 When a bodily injury occurs, the law
27 considers the action as one for
28 personal injuries, regardless of the

5996

1 nature of the breach of duty. It
2 adopts the nature of the damage as the
3 test, and not the nature of the breach
4 . . . it was intended to embrace therein
5 all infringements of personal rights as
6 distinguished from property rights.'
7 (Emphasis in original.)
8
9

10 "(d) It applies to an action based on products liability.
11 (G.D. Searle & Co. (G.D.) v. Superior Court (1975) 49 Cal.App.3d
12 22, 25, 122 Cal.Rptr. 218; Sevilla v. Stearns-Roger (1980)
13 101 Cal.App.3d 608, 610, 161 Cal.Rptr. 700.)
14

15 "In Sevilla v. Stearns-Rogers, supra, defendant
16 manufacturer contended that the products liability action
17 against it was barred under C.C.P. 337.1 and 337.15 because
18 its product had been installed in a sugar refinery which
19 employed plaintiff, and thereby became an 'improvement of
20 real property.' The trial court granted defendant summary
21 judgment. Held, reversed. In products liability actions
22 the one-year period runs from the date of injury, not the
23 date of purchase of the product, and the manufacturer
24 theoretically remains liable indefinitely. (101 Cal.App.3d
25 611.) While the Legislature has imposed outside limits on
26 some claims, there is no indication that it intended
27 manufacturers to be benefited by C.C.P. 337.1 or 337.15.
28 (101 Cal.App.3d 611.)

1 "(e) It applies to an action under the 'dog bite
2 statute' (4 Summary, Torts, §795); the statute merely
3 changed the proof required under the common law action for
4 injuries suffered from a 'vicious' dog. (Pritchard v. Sharp
5 (1974) 41 Cal.App.3d 530, 531, 116 Cal.Rptr. 9.)

6
7 "(f) It applies to an action based on breach of
8 warranty. (Becker v. Volkswagen of America (1975) 52
9 Cal.App.3d 794, 125 Cal.Rptr. 326.)

10
11 "In the Becker case it was contended by plaintiff that
12 the enactment of U.C.C. 2725 (text, §293) changed the law
13 by making applicable the four-year limitation of that
14 section in all cases in which damages for personal injury
15 were sought in an action for breach of warranty. The court
16 examined the conflicting case law in other jurisdictions
17 and the views of Prosser and the Second Torts Restatement
18 on products liability, and concluded that the Commercial
19 Code section was intended to apply to commercial transactions
20 between buyer and seller, and not to personal injury actions,
21 whether based on negligence, strict liability or breach of
22 warranty. (52 Cal.App.3d 800, 802.)

23
24 "(g) It applies to an action for loss of consortium
25 (Priola v. Pauling (1977) 72 Cal.App.3d 380, 383, 140
26 Cal.Rptr. 186.)

27
28 ///

1 "(h) It applies to an action based on ingestion of a
2 drug. (Gray v. Reeves (1977) 76 Cal.App.3d 567, 576, 142
3 Cal.Rptr. 716.)"

4
5 (See 2 Witkin, Cal. Procedure (2d ed. 1970) Actions,
6 §309, p.1153 and 2 Witkin, Cal. Procedure (2d ed. 1983
7 Supp.) Trial, §309, pp.142-143.)

8
9 The California Supreme Court has held that there is no
10 distinction between "fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety,
11 worry, mortification, shock, humiliation, indignity,
12 embarrassment, apprehension, terror or ordeal." (See
13 Capelouto v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals (1982) 7 Cal.3d
14 889, 892-893; 103 Cal.Rptr. 856.)

15
16 It is therefore respectfully submitted that the one-
17 year statute of limitations (Code of Civil Procedure section
18 340(3)) bars the claims of REDACTED for "mental
19 and emotional distress" or any other personal injuries
20 alleged on her behalf in the first amended complaint.

21
22
23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

5999

1 B. The Law Does Not Permit Recovery of Damages
2 for Physical Harm or Emotional Distress
3 Caused by the Knowledge of an Injury to Another Person.

4
5 As stated above, Mrs. REDACTED claims "mental and
6 emotional distress" because her son, REDACTED was
7 sexually molested. The law does not permit recovery of
8 damages for physical harm or emotional distress caused by
9 the knowledge of an injury to another person.

10
11 The opening paragraph of BAJI No. 12.83 states the
12 general rule from Dillon v. Legg (1968) 68 Cal.2d 728:

13
14
15 "Ordinarily the law does not permit
16 recovery of damages for physical harm
17 and emotional distress caused by the
18 knowledge of an injury or death of
19 another person."

20
21
22 The Use Note to BAJI No. 12.83 is also helpful:

23
24
25 "Before giving this instruction,
26 the court must determine as a matter
27 of law whether the accident and
28 harm were reasonably foreseeable,

6000

6 These factors from Dillon v. Legg, supra, were set
7 forth in a jury instruction which was specifically approved
8 in Krouse v. Graham (1977) 19 Cal.3d 59, 137 Cal.Rptr.
9 863. The factors which are relevant here are:

12 "1. Whether plaintiff was located near
13 the scene of the accident as contrasted
14 with one who was a distance away from
15 it:

17 "2. Whether the shock resulted from
18 a direct emotional impact upon plaintiff
19 from the sensory and contemporaneous
20 observance of the accident as contrasted
21 with learning of the accident from others
22 after its occurrence."

6001

25 REDACTED does not allege that she was near the
26 scene when REDACTED was allegedly molested; nor does she allege
27 that her "mental and emotional distress" resulted from
28 the sensory and contemporaneous observance of the alleged

1 molesting of REDACTED Without alleging and proving both of
2 these factors, REDACTED cannot state a cause of
3 action. (See BAJI No. 12.84.)
4

5 In Wynne v. Orcutt Union School Dist. (1971) 17
6 Cal.App.3d 1108; 95 Cal.Rptr. 458, disclosure of a child's
7 fatal illness which caused shock to his parents' nervous
8 system was held not a compensable injury.
9

10 Recovery was also denied in Jansen v. Children's
11 Hosp. (1973) 31 Cal.App.3d 22, 106 Cal.Rptr. 883, where
12 the plaintiff's mother alleged that due to the defendant
13 hospital's negligence her five-year old daughter died a
14 painful death from a gastro-intestinal hemorrhage, that
15 she was with the child during her last hours, and, therefore
16 she suffered emotional trauma from witnessing the death.
17 Judgment for defendant on demurrer was affirmed. The
18 court noted that the Dillon decision "contemplates a
19 sudden and brief event causing the child's injury." (31
20 C.A.3d 24.) The court also noted that the event must be
21 one which can be the subject of sensory perception; that
22 is, visibility of the tortious act itself, not merely the
23 result, is essential. The court held that to extend the
24 Dillon rule to the entire area of injury to a parent by
25 improper diagnosis of a child's ailment is contrary to
26 the Dillon opinion's counsel of moderation. (31 C.A.3d
27 24, 25.)
28

1 In Powers v. Sissoev (1974) 39 Cal.App.3d 865, 874;
2 114 Cal.Rptr. 868, the "Dillon rule" was held inapplicable
3 to shock suffered by the plaintiff mother seeing her
4 injured daughter at home 30-60 minutes after the accident
5 and emergency treatment.

6
7 Similarly, in Hair v. Monterey (1975) 45 Cal.App.3d
8 538, 543; 119 Cal.Rptr. 639, the "Dillon" rule was held
9 inapplicable where the mother was in the waiting room
10 while surgery was being performed on her child and where
11 serious permanent injuries did not develop until two days
12 later. (In the Hair case the court took note as it did
13 in Jansen of Dillon's counsel of "moderation," and observed
14 that, "We chose to heed that caution." (45 C.A.3d 544.))

15
16 In Justus v. Atchison (1977) 19 Cal.3d 564, 139
17 Cal.Rptr. 97, the plaintiff father alleged that he was in
18 the hospital delivery room where his wife was in labor,
19 that he witnessed disturbing developments in emergency
20 procedures, that he witnessed his wife's pain, and that he
21 was present when the attending doctor announced that the
22 fetus had died. Judgment for defendants on demurrer was
23 affirmed.

24
25 In the Justus case, above, the allegations of the
26 complaint showed only physical presence; there was no
27 allegation of a shock resulting from a "sensory and
28 contemporaneous observance of the accident." The event,

1 by its very nature, was hidden from the plaintiff father's
2 perception; nor could he have otherwise sensed it. "To
3 put it another way, he had been admitted to the theatre
4 but the drama was being played on a different stage."
5 (19 C.3d 584.) The disturbing developments induced a
6 sense of anxiety, but it did not become shock until he
7 was actually informed of the death by the doctor. "In
8 short, the impact derived not from what he saw and heard
9 during the attempted delivery, but from what he was told
10 after the fact." (19 C.3d 585.)
11

12 According to REDACTED allegations she did not
13 witness the alleged sexual molestation nor was it an event
14 which was the subject of her sensory perception. According
15 to the allegations in the first amended complaint, she
16 learned about the event much, much later after it allegedly
17 occurred. REDACTED allegations fall far short of
18 those which were adjudged inadequate in the Justus case.
19 In the Justus case the allegations of the complaint
20 showed only physical presence but failed to allege a
21 shock resulting from a "sensory and contemporaneous
22 observance." REDACTED makes no attempt to allege
23 "physical presence" let alone "sensory and contemporaneous
24 observance" of the event.
25

26 Therefore, the defendant Archbishop's demurrer to Mrs.
27 REDACTED ; claims for "mental and emotional distress" (and
28 any other claims for personal injury) should be sustained

1 without leave to amend.

2
3 Alternatively, the defendant Archbishop's motion to
4 strike REDACTED claims for "mental and emotional
5 distress" (and any other claims for personal injuries)
6 should be granted without leave to amend.

7
8
9 III. THE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FAILS TO
10 STATE A CAUSE OF ACTION FOR PUNITIVE DAMAGES
11 AGAINST THE DEFENDANT ARCHBISHOP.

12
13 It is the position of the defendant Archbishop that
14 in addition to the reasons set out in the points above
15 that the plaintiffs' first amended complaint fails to
16 state any facts upon which an award of punitive damages
17 may be predicated against it.

18
19 The essential allegations of the first amended
20 complaint in regards to punitive damages are set forth in
21 paragraphs 15, 17, 18, 19, 32, 38, 41, 42, 55, 61, 63,
22 64, 65, 77, 88, 90, 91, 92 and 105. However, each of
23 these paragraphs uses or repeats one or more of the
24 following conclusions: "maliciously," "wanton and conscious
25 disregard of the rights and feelings of plaintiff,"
26 "intentional and malicious," "malicious, extreme and
27 outrageous acts," "malicious and oppressive," "intentional,
28 malicious, and extreme acts."

1 The allegations of punitive damages set forth below
2 are representative of the other "punitive damages" paragraphs
3 (enumerated in the last paragraph):

4
5 "19. The conduct of Defendants, ROEMER,
6 ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE and ST. PASCHAL'S,
7 and each of them, in doing the acts herein-
8 above alleged was malicious and oppressive
9 and said Defendants were guilty of wanton
10 disregard of the rights and feelings of
11 Plaintiff and by reason thereof, Plaintiff
12 demands exemplary and punitive damages
13 against Defendants in an amount according
14 to proof."

15
16 "61. In making the uninvited and
17 unprovoked attacks on Plaintiff as
18 heretofore alleged, Defendant ROEMER
19 acted maliciously and was guilty of
20 wanton and conscious disregard of the
21 rights and feelings of Plaintiff, and
22 by reason thereof Plaintiff demands
23 exemplary damages against Defendants
24 ROEMER, ARCHBISHOP, ARCHDIOCESE, and
25 ST. PASCHAL's in an amount according to
26 proof."

27
28 ///

6006

1 Such allegations fail when measured under the standards
2 set up by the statute and by the California cases.

3
4 Punitive damages are authorized by section 3294 of the
5 Civil Code (1983). It provides:

6
7
8 "(a) In an action for the breach of an
9 obligation not arising from contract,
10 where the defendant has been guilty of
11 oppression, fraud, or malice, the
12 plaintiff, in addition to the actual
13 damages may recover damages for the
14 sake of example and by way of punishing
15 the defendant.

16
17 "(b) An employer shall not be liable
18 for damages pursuant to subdivision
19 (a), based upon acts of an employee of
20 the employer, unless the employer had
21 advance knowledge of the unfitness of
22 the employee and employed him or her
23 with a conscious disregard of the rights
24 or safety of others or authorized or
25 ratified the wrongful conduct for which
26 the damages are awarded or was personally
27 guilty of oppression, fraud, or malice.
28 With respect to a corporate employer,

1 the advance knowledge and conscious
2 disregard, authorization, ratification
3 or act of oppression, fraud, or malice
4 must be on the part of an officer,
5 director, or managing agent of the
6 corporation."

7
8
9 Thus, in order to recover punitive damages plaintiffs
10 must plead and prove either malice, oppression or fraud;
11 plaintiffs must also plead and prove that the defendant
12 Archbishop had advance knowledge of the unfitness of the
13 defendant priest and assigned him to his respective post
14 with a conscious disregard of the rights or safety of
15 others or that the Archbishop authorized or ratified the
16 priest's wrongful conduct. Clearly the allegations of
17 the first amended complaint amount to none of these.

18
19 Initially, it should be noted that terms such as
20 "maliciously," "wanton and conscious disregard," "intentional
21 and malicious," "malicious, extreme and outrageous acts,"
22 and the like, may not be considered in support of the
23 pleading when challenged by demurrer:

24
25
26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 "[T]he general rule [is] that a complaint
2 must contain only allegations of ultimate
3 facts as opposed to allegations of
4 evidentiary facts or of legal conclusions
5 or arguments," (Burke v. Superior Court
6 (1969) 71 Cal.2d 276, 279; see also
7 Krug v. Meeham (1952) 109 Cal.App.2d 274.)

8
9
10 The general rule is that on demurrer, in determining
11 whether a cause of action is properly stated, the court
12 will take into consideration only well pleaded facts.
13 (Daar v. Yellow Cab Co. (1967) 67 Cal.2d 695; Serrano v.
14 Priest (1971) 5 Cal.3d 584.)

15
16 Therefore, inasmuch as the terms "maliciously,"
17 "wanton and conscious disregard," "intentional and malicious,"
18 "malicious, extreme and outrageous acts," and the like are
19 conclusions and under the rule set forth above, they must
20 be disregarded.

21
22 In Wise v. Southern Pacific Co. (1963) 223 Cal.App.2d
23 50, the court considered the status of such words.
24 Although it was held that because of other material in the
25 complaint the demurrer should not have been sustained, it
26 as instructive to examine the court's characterization of
27 certain language:
28

1 "Equally conclusionary and defective are
2 allegations that an act was 'wrongful,'
3 'illegal,' 'without authority,' 'unlawful,'
4 'unjust,' 'arbitrary,' or 'fraudulent' which
5 without additional allegations raised no
6 triable issue. (223 Cal.App.2d 50, 60 [emphasis
7 in original]; see also Hancock v. Burns (1958)
8 158 Cal.App.2d 785, disapproving as con-
9 clusionary: "willfully," "wrongfully," and
10 "maliciously.")

11
12
13 "Gross error" and "arbitrariness" are other examples
14 of the kinds of words and phrases which have been classed
15 as legal conclusions inadequate to support pleadings
16 unless accompanied by more specific averments. (Clack v.
17 State of California (1969) 275 Cal.App.2d 743, 749.) "Gross
18 negligence" has been held a conclusion of law. (Barlett v.
19 Jackson (1936) 13 Cal.App.2d 435, 437; Nicholas v. Smith (1934)
20 136 Cal.App. 272, 276-277.) The descriptive words "improperly
21 and unlawfully" and "wrongfully, falsely, fraudulently,
22 maliciously and unlawfully" have also been held conclusions
23 of law. (Jones v. Oxnard Schood Dist. (1969) 270 Cal.App.2d
24 587, 592.)

25
26 In the first amended complaint fraud is not alleged;
27 thus, we are left with allegations concerning "malice"
28 and "oppression."

1 The leading California case on pleading "malice" is
2 Gombos v. Ashe (1958) 158 Cal.App.2d 517 (rev'd other
3 grounds in Taylor v. Superior Court (1979) 24 Cal.3d
4 890, 157 Cal.Rptr. 693) in which the court held that the
5 allegations in the complaint were insufficient as a
6 matter of law to show malice on the part of a drunken
7 driver. The complaint alleged:

8
9
10 "[D]efendant was then and there
11 knowingly and willfully intoxicated,
12 having had [sic] overindulged in
13 alcoholic refreshments, well knowing
14 that at said time and place the
15 excessive alcoholic refreshments
16 consumed by him rendered him physically
17 unfit to operate a motor vehicle upon
18 said public highway, and that he
19 knew the combination of alcohol and
20 fatigue made him a menace to all
21 persons using said highway, including
22 the plaintiffs." (158 Cal.App.2d 517,
23 526.)

24
25
26 It should be noted that what was alleged in Gombos
27 v. Ashe, supra, was essentially that the plaintiff
28 intentionally became intoxicated with a reckless disregard

1 of its consequences to others on the highway. The Court
2 of Appeals held this insufficient as a matter of law to
3 show malice.

4
5
6 "In order to warrant the allowance of
7 [punitive] damages the act complained
8 of must not only be willful, in the
9 sense of intentional, but it must be
10 accompanied by some aggravating
11 circumstance, amounting to malice.
12 Malice implies an act conceived in a
13 spirit of mischief or with criminal
14 indifference towards the obligations
15 owed to others. There must be an
16 intent to vex, annoy, or injure."
17 (158 Cal.App.2d 517, 526-527.)

18
19
20 This same requirement of an intent to do harm was
21 echoed in Ebaugh v. Rabkin (1972) 22 Cal.App.3d 891, a
22 medical malpractice case. In reversing the jury's award
23 of punitive damages, the court stated:

24
25
26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 "In the instant case there is simply no
2 evidence that any of the appellants
3 [defendants] were guilty of malice,
4 either 'express or implied.' On the
5 contrary, the record negates any
6 conclusion that the unauthorized
7 operation on respondent's person
8 took place out of evil motive or
9 criminal indifference by appellants,
10 or with an intent to injure or do harm
11 to respondent for the mere satisfaction
12 of doing it." (22 C.A.3d 891, 895.)
13
14

15 Oppression also requires this personal motive to vex,
16 annoy or injure. Although no California case has been found
17 in which punitive damages have been awarded on the basis
18 of oppression alone, the term has been defined in conjunction
19 with that of malice. For example, in Baker v. Peck (1934)
20 1 Cal.App.2d 231, 36 P.2d 404 the complaint alleged:
21
22

23 " . . . that 'defendant . . .
24 maliciously and intending thereby
25 to oppress plaintiff, violently
26 struck plaintiff ' " (1 Cal.
27 App.2d 235.)
28

1 The court, in defining oppression, stated:

2
3
4 "Oppression is defined by the Standard
5 Dictionary as 'An act of subjecting to
6 cruel and unjust hardship,' and in
7 46 Corpus Juris, page 1121, as 'An act
8 of . . . dominion'." (1 Cal.App.2d
9 235; cited with approval in Roth v.
10 Shell Oil Co. (1960) 185 Cal.App.2d
11 676, 8 Cal.Rptr. 514. See also
12 G.D. Searle & Co. v. Superior Court
13 (1975) 49 Cal.App.2d 22, and, Richarson
14 v. Employer's Liab. Assur. Corp. (1972)
15 25 Cal.App.3d 232, 246.)

16
17
18 In 1980 the legislature amended Civil Code section
19 3294 and defined "oppression" as "subjecting a person to
20 cruel and unjust hardship in conscious disregard of that
21 person's rights." (Civil Code §3294(c)(2).) It is
22 respectfully submitted that plaintiffs' first amended
23 complaint fails to properly allege that the defendant
24 Archbishop subjected any of the plaintiffs to cruel and
25 unjust hardship in conscious disregard of that person's
26 rights.

27
28 ///

1 In Brousseau v. Jarrett (1977) 73 Cal.App.3d 864,
2 141 Cal.Rptr. 200 it was held that the complaint's conclusory
3 characterization of the defendant physician's conduct as
4 intentional, willful, and fraudulent was an insufficient
5 statement of "oppression, fraud, or malice, express or
6 implied" within the meaning of section 3294.

7
8 Similarly, in G.D. Searle & Co. v. Superior Court
9 for Sacramento County (1975) 49 Cal.App.3d 22, 122
10 Cal.Rptr. 218, a complaint against a pharmaceutical
11 manufacturer was held insufficient with respect to the
12 demand for exemplary damages where the allegations of
13 wrongful, knowing and willful conduct were conclusionary
14 and the complaint failed to allege that the manufacturer
15 either intended to injure customers or acted in conscious
16 disregard of their safety, despite the contention that it
17 was sufficient to alleged reckless disregard of potential
18 danger.

19
20 Thus, the first amended complaint fails to allege
21 either malice, oppression or fraud against the defendant
22 Archbishop and therefore fails to state a cause of action
23 with respect to punitive damages as against the defendant
24 Roman Catholic Archbishop.

25
26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

6015

Conclusion

The Alma W. case represents the clear weight of authority that no matter how one's claim is styled, adjectived or otherwise described, the defendant Archbishop may not be held liable for the defendant priest's acts of a sexual nature; such misconduct is beyond the course or scope of a priest's duties as a matter of law.

The same is true of the assault and battery, the intentional infliction of emotional distress, the negligent infliction of emotional distress and the negligent employment theories: they all spring from the same well of sexual misconduct. Thus the holding in Alma W. should be controlling and the defendant Archbishop's demurrers should be sustained without leave to amend.

The claim of REDACTED for mental and emotional distress is admittedly somewhat different from the other causes of action. Her claim arose in 1980 but she did not file her original complaint until 1984. Clearly the one-year statute of limitations (Code of Civil Procedure section 340(3)) bars her claim. Furthermore, her pleadings do not bring her claim within the holding in Dillon v. Legg because she was not at all near the scene of the incidents; nor did she sustain her injuries from any "sensory and contemporaneous" observation of the alleged molesting of her son, REDACTED. Thus her claim is barred no

1 matter from which vantage point one views it.

2

3 Therefore, the demurrers of the defendant Archbishop
4 should be sustained without leave to amend. Alternatively,
5 the motions to strike should be granted without leave to
6 amend.

7

8

Respectfully submitted,
REDACTED

9 DATED: August 1, 1984

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

6017

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 1545 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 800, Los Angeles, California 90017.

On August 1, 1984, I served the foregoing document described as MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF DEMURRER AND MOTION TO STRIKE OF ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES, A CORPORATION SOLE, TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT on the parties in this action by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Los Angeles, California as follows:

REDACTED

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on August 1, 1984 at Los Angeles, California.

REDACTED

1 REDACTED

FILED

AUG -9 1984

RICHARD D. DEAN, County Clerk

By _____
Deputy County Clerk

5 Attorneys for Defendant, ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES,
6 a corporation sole

7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
8 FOR THE COUNTY OF VENTURA

RECEIVED

AUG 14 1984

10 REDACTED

MORGAN, VANCEL
McNICHOLAS

Case No. 82750

DATE: September 5, 1984
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
DEPT: 41

17 Plaintiffs,

18 v.

19 ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF LOS
20 ANGELES, a California Corporation;
21 ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES,
22 EDUCATION AND WELFARE CORPORATION,
23 a California Corporation; PATRICK
24 ROEMER; FATHER COLM O'RYAN; ST.
25 PASCHAL BAYLON CATHOLIC CHURCH, an
26 unincorporated association; and
27 DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

28 Defendants.

NOTICE OF DEMURRER AND
DEMURRER OF ROMAN CATHOLIC
ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES,
A CORPORATION SOLE, TO
PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED
COMPLAINT

(Motion to Strike Filed
Concurrently Herewith)

26 TO EACH OF THE PLAINTIFFS HEREIN AND TO REDACTED
27 REDACTED THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:
28

1 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on September 5, 1984 at 9:00 a.m.
2 in Department 41 of the above entitled court, defendant,
3 Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles, a corporation
4 sole, erroneously sued and served herein as "Roman Catholic
5 Archbishop of Los Angeles, a California Corporation" and as
6 "Archdiocese of Los Angeles, Education and Welfare Corporation,
7 a California Corporation," (hereinafter "Archbishop") and
8 for itself and no other, will and does demur to plaintiffs'
9 first amended complaint on the following grounds:

10
11
12 Entire First Amended Complaint
13

14 1. None of the five causes of action alleges
15 facts sufficient to state a cause of action as against
16 demurring defendant.
17

18
19 First Cause of Action
20

21 2. The first cause of action is uncertain in that it
22 cannot be determined therefrom how or in what manner
23 demurring defendant may be liable to plaintiff.
24

25 3. The first cause of action fails to allege facts
26 sufficient to state a cause of action as against demurring
27 defendant.
28

5963

1 4. The first cause of action is further uncertain in
2 that it cannot be determined therefrom how or in what manner
3 demurring defendant may be subject to punitive damages.

4
5 5. The first cause of action fails to allege facts
6 sufficient to state a claim for punitive damages against
7 demurring defendant.

8
9 Second Cause of Action

10
11 6. The second cause of action is uncertain in that it
12 cannot be determined therefrom how or in what manner demurring
13 defendant may be liable to plaintiff.

14
15 7. The second cause of action fails to allege facts
16 sufficient to state a cause of action as against demurring
17 defendant.

18
19 8. The second cause of action is further uncertain in
20 that it cannot be determined therefrom how or in what manner
21 demurring defendant may be subject to punitive damages.

22
23 9. The second cause of action fails to allege facts
24 sufficient to state a claim for punitive damages against
25 this demurring defendant.

26
27 ///
28

5964

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Third Cause of Action

10. The third cause of action is uncertain in that it cannot be determined therefrom how or in what manner demurring defendant may be liable to plaintiff.

11. The third cause of action fails to allege facts sufficient to state a cause of action as against demurring defendant.

Fourth Cause of Action

12. The fourth cause of action is uncertain in that it cannot be determined therefrom how or in what manner demurring defendant may be liable to plaintiff.

13. The fourth cause of action fails to allege facts sufficient to state a cause of action as against demurring defendant.

14. The fourth cause of action is further uncertain in that it cannot be determined therefrom how or in what manner demurring defendant may be subject to punitive damages.

///
///

1 15. The fourth cause of action fails to allege facts
2 sufficient to state a claim for punitive damages against
3 demurring defendant.

4
5
6 Fifth Cause of Action
7

8 16. The fifth cause of action is uncertain in that it
9 cannot be determined therefrom how or in what manner demurring
10 defendant may be liable to plaintiff.
11

12 17. The fifth cause of action fails to allege facts
13 sufficient to state a cause of action as against demurring
14 defendant.
15

16 18. The fifth cause of action is further uncertain in
17 that it cannot be determined therefrom how or in what manner
18 demurring defendant may be subject to punitive damages.
19

20 19. The fifth cause of action fails to allege facts
21 sufficient to state a claim for punitive damages against
22 demurring defendant.
23

24
25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 5966

1 Sixth Cause of Action

2
3 20. The sixth cause of action is uncertain in that it
4 cannot be determined therefrom how or in what manner
5 demurring defendant may be liable to plaintiff.
6

7 21. The sixth cause of action fails to allege facts
8 sufficient to state a cause of action as against demurring
9 defendant.
10

11 22. The sixth cause of action is further uncertain in
12 that it cannot be determined therefrom how or in what manner
13 demurring defendant may be subject to punitive damages.
14

15 23. The sixth cause of action fails to allege facts
16 sufficient to state a claim for punitive damages against
17 demurring defendant.
18

19
20 Seventh Cause of Action

21
22 24. The seventh cause of action is uncertain in that it
23 cannot be determined therefrom how or in what manner demurring
24 defendant may be liable to plaintiff.
25

26 25. The seventh cause of action fails to allege facts
27 sufficient to state a cause of action as against demurring
28 defendant.

1 Eighth Cause of Action

2

3 26. The eighth cause of action is uncertain in that it

4 cannot be determined therefrom how or in what manner demurring

5 defendant may be liable to plaintiff.

6

7 27. The eighth cause of action fails to allege facts

8 sufficient to state a cause of action as against demurring

9 defendant.

10

11 28. The eighth cause of action is further uncertain in

12 that it cannot be determined therefrom how or in what manner

13 demurring defendant may be subject to punitive damages.

14

15 29. The eighth cause of action fails to allege facts

16 sufficient to state a claim for punitive damages against

17 demurring defendant.

18

19

20 Ninth Cause of Action

21

22 30. The ninth cause of action is uncertain in that it

23 cannot be determined therefrom how or in what manner demurring

24 defendant may be liable to plaintiff.

25

26 31. The ninth cause of action fails to allege facts

27 sufficient to state a cause of action as against demurring

28 defendant.

5 33. The ninth cause of action fails to allege facts
6 sufficient to state a claim for punitive damages against
7 demurring defendant.

10 Tenth Cause of Action

34. The tenth cause of action is uncertain in that it cannot be determined therefrom how or in what manner demurring defendant may be liable to plaintiff.

35. The tenth cause of action fails to allege facts sufficient to state a cause of action as against demurring defendant.

36. The tenth cause of action is further uncertain in that it cannot be determined therefrom how or in what manner demurring defendant may be subject to punitive damages.

37. The tenth cause of action fails to allege facts sufficient to state a claim for punitive damages against demurring defendant.

1 Eleventh Cause of Action

2

3 38. The eleventh cause of action is uncertain in that it

4 cannot be determined therefrom how or in what manner demurring

5 defendant may be liable to plaintiff.

6

7 39. The eleventh cause of action fails to allege

8 facts sufficient to state a cause of action as against

9 demurring defendant.

10

11

12 Twelfth Cause of Action

13

14 40. The twelfth cause of action is uncertain in that

15 it cannot be determined therefrom how or in what manner

16 demurring defendant may be liable to plaintiff.

17

18 41. The twelfth cause of action fails to allege facts

19 sufficient to state a cause of action as against demurring

20 defendant.

21

22 42. The twelfth cause of action is further uncertain in

23 that it cannot be determined therefrom how or in what manner

24 demurring defendant may be subject to punitive damages.

25

26 43. The twelfth cause of action fails to allege facts

27 sufficient to state a claim for punitive damages against

28 demurring defendant.

1 Thirteenth Cause of Action

2
3 44. The thirteenth cause of action is uncertain in
4 that it cannot be determined therefrom how or in what
5 manner demurring defendant may be liable to plaintiff.
6

7 45. The thirteenth cause of action fails to allege
8 facts sufficient to state a cause of action as against
9 demurring defendant.
10

11
12 Fourteenth Cause of Action

13
14 46. The fourteenth cause of action is uncertain in
15 that it cannot be determined therefrom how or in what
16 manner demurring defendant may be liable to plaintiff.
17

18 47. The fourteenth cause of action fails to allege
19 facts sufficient to state a cause of action as against
20 demurring defendant.
21

22 48. The fourteenth cause of action is further uncertain
23 in that it cannot be determined therefrom how or in what
24 manner demurring defendant may be subject to punitive
25 damages.
26

5971

27 49. The fourteenth cause of action fails to allege
28 facts sufficient to state a claim for punitive damages

1 against demurring defendant.
2

3
4
5 Fifteenth Cause of Action

6 50. The fifteenth cause of action is uncertain in
7 that it cannot be determined therefrom how or in what
8 manner demurring defendant may be liable to plaintiff.
9

10 51. The fifteenth cause of action fails to allege
11 facts sufficient to state a cause of action as against
12 demurring defendant.
13

14 52. The fifteenth cause of action is further uncertain
15 in that it cannot be determined therefrom how or in what
16 manner demurring defendant may be subject to punitive
17 damages.
18

19 53. The fifteenth cause of action fails to allege
20 facts sufficient to state a claim for punitive damages
21 against demurring defendant.
22

23
24
25 Sixteenth Cause of Action

5972

26 54. The sixteenth cause of action is uncertain in
27 that it cannot be determined therefrom how or in what
28

1 manner demurring defendant may be liable to plaintiff.
2

3 55. The sixteenth cause of action fails to allege
4 facts sufficient to state a cause of action as against
5 demurring defendant.
6
7

8 Seventeenth Cause of Action
9

10 56. The seventeenth cause of action is uncertain in
11 that it cannot be determined therefrom how or in what
12 manner demurring defendant may be liable to plaintiff.
13

14 57. The seventeenth cause of action fails to allege
15 facts sufficient to state a cause of action as against
16 demurring defendant.
17

18 58. The seventeenth cause of action is further uncertain
19 in that it cannot be determined therefrom how or in what
20 manner demurring defendant may be subject to punitive
21 damages.
22

23 59. The seventeenth cause of action fails to allege
24 facts sufficient to state a claim for punitive damages
25 against demurring defendant.
26

5973

27 60. There is a misjoinder of parties in the seventeenth
28 cause of action in that the cause of action of REDACTED

1 REDACTED for "mental and emotional distress" should be
2 separately stated from that of her minor son, REDACTED
3
4

5 The above demurrers are based upon this notice of
6 demurrer and demurrer, the attached memorandum of points
7 and authorities, and the pleadings, records, files herein,
8 and on such evidence and oral argument as may be presented
9 at the hearing.

10 REDACTED

11 DATED: August 1, 1984
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

5974

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 1545 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 800, Los Angeles, California 90017.

On August 1, 1984, I served the foregoing document described as NOTICE OF DEMURRER AND DEMURRER OF ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES, A CORPORATION SOLE, TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT on the parties in this action by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Los Angeles, California as follows:

REDACTED

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on August 1, 1984 at Los Angeles, California.

REDACTED

1 REDACTED

Filed: 8/9/84
(Confirmed w/ clerk)

2
3
4
5 Attorneys for Defendant, ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES,
6 a corporation sole

7
8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9 FOR THE COUNTY OF VENTURA

10
11 REDACTED

12)
13)
14) Case No. 82750
15)
16)

17) DATE: September 5, 1984
18) TIME: 9:00 a.m.
19) DEPT: 41
20)
21)

22 Plaintiffs,

23 v.

24) NOTICE OF MOTION AND
25) MOTION TO STRIKE
26) PORTIONS OF PLAINTIFFS'
27) FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

28 ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF LOS
ANGELES, a California Corporation;
ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES,
EDUCATION AND WELFARE CORPORATION,
a California Corporation; PATRICK
ROEMER; FATHER COLM O'RYAN; ST.
PASCHAL BAYLON CATHOLIC CHURCH, an
unincorporated association; and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

29) (Demurrer Filed
30) Concurrently Herewith)

31 Defendants.

32 TO EACH OF THE PLAINTIFFS HEREIN AND TO REDACTED

33 REDACTED THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

1 COMES NOW defendant the Roman Catholic Archbishop of
2 Los Angeles, a corporation sole, erroneously sued and
3 served herein as "Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles,
4 a California Corporation," (herein Roman Catholic Archbishop
5 of Los Angeles) and moves the court for its order striking
6 the following portions from the plaintiffs' first amended
7 complaint:

8
9
10 First Cause of Action
11

12 1. In paragraph 15 on page 7 at line 1, the words
13 "maliciously" and "wanton and conscious disregard of the
14 rights and feelings of Plaintiff" on the grounds that
15 such words whether taken individually or together constitute
16 conclusions of law and therefore may not be considered as
17 against the moving party defendant.

18
19 2. In paragraph 15 on page 7 at line 5, the
20 words, "exemplary and punitive damages" on the grounds
21 that no cause of action for punitive damages has been
22 stated as against the moving party defendant.

23
24
25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 5950

Second Cause of Action

3. In paragraph 17 on page 7 at lines 17-18, the words "intentional and malicious" on the grounds that such words whether taken individually or together constitute conclusions of law and therefore may not be considered as against the moving party defendant.

4. In paragraph 18 on page 7, at line 26, the words, "malicious, extreme and outrageous acts" on the grounds that such words whether taken individually or together constitute conclusions of law and therefore may not be considered as against the moving party defendant.

5. In paragraph 19 on page 8 at lines 3-4, the words, "malicious and oppressive" and "wanton disregard of the rights and feelings of Plaintiff" on the grounds that such words whether taken individually or together constitute conclusions of law and therefore may not be considered as against the moving party defendant.

6. In paragraph 19 on page 8 at line 6, the words, "exemplary and punitive damages" on the grounds that no cause of action for punitive damages has been stated as against the moving party defendant.

///

///

1 Fourth Cause of Action

2

3 7. In paragraph 32 on page 11 at lines 25-26,
4 the words, "conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff"
5 on the grounds that such words whether taken individually
6 or together constitute conclusions of law and therefore
7 may not be considered as against the moving party defendant.

8

9 8. In paragraph 32 on page 11 at line 28, the
10 words, "punitive and exemplary damages" on the grounds
11 that no cause of action for punitive damages has been
12 stated as against the moving party defendant.

13

14

15 Fifth Cause of Action

16

17 9. In paragraph 38 on page 13 at lines 13-14, the
18 words, "wanton and conscious disregard of the rights and
19 feelings of Plaintiff" on the grounds that such words
20 whether taken individually or together constitute
21 conclusions of law and therefore may not be considered as
22 against moving party defendant.

23

24 10. In paragraph 38 on page 13 at line 15, the
25 words, "exemplary and punitive damages" on the grounds
26 that no cause of action for punitive damages has been
27 stated as against the moving party defendant.

Sixth Cause of Action

11. In paragraph 41 on page 14 at line 11, the words, "malicious, extreme and outrageous acts of the Defendants" on the grounds that such words whether taken individually or together constitute conclusions of law and therefore may not be considered as against moving party defendant.

12. In paragraph 42 on page 14 at lines 16-18, the words, "malicious and oppressive" and "wanton disregard of the rights and feelings of Plaintiff" on the grounds that such words whether taken individually or together constitute conclusions of law and therefore may not be considered as against moving party defendant.

13. In paragraph 42 on page 14 at line 19, the words "exemplary and punitive damages" on the grounds that no cause of action for punitive damages has been stated as against the moving party defendant.

///

///

///

///

///

///

5953

1 Eighth Cause of Action

2

3 14. In paragraph 55 on page 18 at lines 11-12, the

4 words, "conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff"

5 on the grounds that such words taken individually or

6 together constitute conclusions of law and therefore may

7 not be considered as against moving party defendant.

8

9 15. In paragraph 55 on page 18 at lines 13-14, the

10 words, "punitive and exemplary damages" on the grounds

11 that no cause of action for punitive damages has been

12 stated against the moving party defendant.

13

14

15 Ninth Cause of Action

16

17 16. In paragraph 61 on page 20 lines 11-12, the

18 words, "maliciously" and "wanton and conscious disregard

19 of the rights and feelings of Plaintiff" on the grounds

20 that such words taken individually or together constitute

21 conclusions of law and therefore may not be considered as

22 against moving party defendant.

23

24 17. In paragraph 61 on page 20 line 13, the words,

25 "exemplary and punitive damages" on the grounds that no

26 cause of action for punitive damages has been stated as

27 against the moving party defendant.

28

Tenth Cause of Action

18. In paragraph 63 on page 20 at lines 25-26, the words "intentional and malicious" on the grounds that such words whether taken individually or together constitute conclusions of law and therefore may not be considered as against the moving party defendant.

19. In paragraph 64 on page 21 at line 7, the words, "intentional , malicious, extreme and outrageous acts" on the grounds that such words whether taken individually or together constitute conclusions of law and therefore may not be considered as against the moving party defendant.

20. In paragraph 65 on page 21 at lines 13-14, the words, "malicious and oppressive" and "wanton disregard of the rights and feelings of Plaintiff" on the grounds that such words whether taken individually or together constitute conclusions of law and therefore may not be considered as against moving party defendant.

21. In paragraph 65 on page 21 at line 16, the words, "exemplary and punitive damages" on the grounds that no cause of action for punitive damages has been stated as against moving party defendant.

///

5955

1 Twelfth Cause of Action

2
3 22. In paragraph 78 on page 24 at line 22, the words,
4 "conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff" on the
5 grounds that such words whether taken individually or
6 together constitute conclusions of law and therefore may
7 not be considered as against moving party defendants.
8

9 23. In paragraph 78 on page 24 at line 23, the
10 words, "punitive and exemplary damages" on the grounds
11 that no cause of action for punitive damages has been
12 stated as against moving party defendant.
13
14

15 Thirteenth Cause of Action

16
17 24. All of paragraph 85 on page 26 on the grounds
18 (a) that plaintiff, REDACTED , claim for personal
19 injuries is barred by the one-year statute of limitations,
20 Code of Civil Procedure, section 340(3) in that she has
21 alleged that her cause of action for personal injury
22 arose on May 10, 1980 (see paragraph 82) and the original
23 complaint was filed more than one year thereafter, on
24 February 23, 1984; (b) that no "Dillon" cause of action
25 is stated.
26
27

28 ///

5956

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Fourteenth Cause of Action

25. In paragraph 88 on page 28 at lines 4-5, the words "maliciously" and "wanton and conscious disregard of the rights and feelings of Plaintiff" on the grounds that such words whether taken individually or together constitute conclusions of law and therefore may not be considered as against moving party defendant.

26. In paragraph 88 on page 28 at line 6, the words, "exemplary and punitive damages" on the grounds that no cause of action for punitive damages has been stated as against moving party defendant.

Fifteenth Cause of Action

27. In paragraph 90 on page 28 at lines 19-20, the words, "intentional and malicious" on the grounds that such words whether taken individually or together constitute conclusions of law and therefore may not be considered as against the moving party defendant.

28. In paragraph 91 on page 29 at line 2, the words, "intentional, malicious, extreme and outrageous acts" on the grounds that such words whether taken individually or together constitute conclusions of law and therefore may not be considered as against the moving party defendant.

5957

8 30. In paragraph 92 on page 29 at line 10, the
9 words, "exemplary and punitive damages on the grounds
10 that no cause of action for punitive damages has been
11 stated as against the moving party defendant.

14 Seventeenth Cause of Action

31. In paragraph 105 on page 33 at line 1, the words, "conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff" on the grounds that such words whether taken individually or together constitute conclusions of law and therefore may not be considered as against the moving party defendant.

22 32. In paragraph 105 on page 33 at line 2, the
23 words, "punitive and exemplary damages" on the grounds
24 that no cause of action for punitive damages has been
25 stated as against the moving party defendant.

27 33. In the prayer, on page 33 at lines 13-14, the
28 words, "3. For exemplary and punitive damages in a sum

1 according to proof" on the grounds that no cause of
2 action has been stated as against the moving party defendant.

3
4 34. In the prayer, on page 34 at lines 2-3, the
5 words, "4. For exemplary and punitive damages in a sum
6 according to proof" on the grounds that no cause of
7 action has been stated as against this moving party
8 defendant.

9
10 35. To the extent that any cause of action has
11 attempted to incorporate by reference one or more of the
12 above referenced paragraphs which are the subject of this
13 motion to strike such incorporated paragraphs of the
14 complaint are incorporated by reference into this motion
15 to strike.

16
17 This motion to strike will be based upon Code of
18 Civil Procedure, section 435, and upon the grounds that
19 the above mentioned language in plaintiffs' first amended
20 complaint is irrelevant, redundant, immaterial, conclusionary
21 and evidentiary, and upon the additional ground that
22 there are not sufficient facts properly stated or pleaded
23 to constitute a claim for punitive or exemplary damages
24 as against the moving party defendant. Therefore the
25 above language should be stricken from plaintiffs' first
26 amended complaint as to the moving party defendant.

27
28 ///

5959

1 DATED: August 1, 1984

REDACTED

2

REDACTED

3

4

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 1545 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 800, Los Angeles, California 90017.

On August 1, 1984, I served the foregoing document described as NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO STRIKE PORTIONS OF PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT on the parties in this action by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Los Angeles, California as follows:

REDACTED

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on August 1, 1984 at Los Angeles, California.

REDACTED

2 — NEWS Sunday, September 16, 1984/DAILY NEWS
Southern California report

Judge: archdiocese can be held liable for actions of priest who molested boys

By WALT STEIGMEIR
Daily News Staff Writer

The Roman Catholic archdiocese of Los Angeles can be held liable for the conduct of a priest who was convicted of molesting boys in Thousand Oaks, a judge has ruled.

Judge Joe D. Hadden of the Ventura County Superior Court this month refused to dismiss the archdiocese as a defendant in a civil lawsuit that was filed by parents of boys who were named as victims of molestations committed by the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer in 1980 and 1981.

The judge's ruling means the lawsuit against the archdiocese of Los Angeles, Roemer, his superior the Rev. Colin O'Han and St. Paschal Bayton Catholic Church in Thousand Oaks can proceed.

The parents of four boys, ages 8 to 12 at the time of the charges, brought the lawsuit against the archdiocese in February 1981. Roemer had pleaded no contest to three charges. Two of these counts involve boys named in the civil lawsuit.

The charges involving the other two boys were dismissed as part of a plea bargain. Roemer, 40, was declared a men-

tally disordered sex offender and hospitalized for 22 months before being released to Ventura County. He was then placed on 10 years probation.

The Los Angeles archdiocese, following the filing of the civil lawsuit last year, asked a demurrer to the complaint and sought to have the civil case dismissed against it.

The arguments advanced by the archdiocese's attorney John P. McNicholas, who said that the archdiocese cannot be held liable against it.

Roemer admitted that he had fondled all the boys listed

vicariously for Roemer's actions because molesting of the boys in no way could be viewed as the occupational duties of a priest.

McNicholas cited a 1981 Court of Appeal case in which a school district was named a defendant in a civil case after a custodian molested and raped a student on school district grounds. The appellate court threw out the action against the district on the grounds the custodian was not

acting in the course of his employment.

Hadden refused to accept the arguments put forth on behalf of the archdiocese. He instead relied on arguments put forth by the attorneys for the children, their parents and lawyers Louis Samonsky and Pamela Klebaum of Camarillo.

They note the archdiocese should be held liable for Roemer's conduct on two grounds: that it had prior knowledge of Roemer's sexual attraction toward young males and that molestings of two boys occurred after a mother told a St. Paschal's official that Roemer had molested her son while he was on a religious retreat in May 1980.

Roemer, during an interview with Sheriff's detective Kelli McIlvian following his arrest in 1981, said he had earlier sought psychological help for his problem. He said he told a priest in Santa Barbara about his attraction for boys.

In a later interview in 1981, Roemer told Dr. Donald J. Rattison that his priest he confided in was also a clinical psychologist and he had limited contact with this man and was not

able to work out the concerns he had about his behavior toward minors.

Roemer also admitted to another psychiatrist, Dr. Ronald A. Markman, that he had fondled all the boys listed as victims and that going back to 1970, he had involvement with over 20 children.

All the interviews are official court records.

Samonsky and Klebaum allege in the civil lawsuit that the Los Angeles archdiocese should have been informed of Roemer's tendencies and should have actively yet the archdiocese still allowed Roemer contact with children at St. Paschal's, "in complete disregard to the rights of safety" of the children, the plaintiffs' lawyers state.

In the case involving two of the boys, then 7 and 10, their molesting occurred after a complaint about Roemer's illegal conduct, Samonsky and Kle-

baum point out. One of the boys was molested Jan. 19, 1981, and the other was molested Jan. 26, 1981. Roemer later pleaded no contest to these charges.

WHITE SALE SAVE 15% TO 50% ON EVERYTHING IN OUR BED AND BATH SHOPS

Collect all you need for your bedroom and bath during our great big White Sale. All sale prices effective through October 21, 1984.

4.99 Twin
SAVE 20% TO 50% ON FIELDCREST®
EMPRESS GARDEN SHEETS AND CASES
Classic floral pattern with peach flowers on a forest green ground. The softest cotton/polyester percale. In Bedroom Accessories, 75
Twin, Reg. 10.00. **4.99**



6.99 Bath
SAVE 25% TO 50% ON FIELDCREST®
ARABIAN COTTON WEAVE TOWELS
Textured waffle-weave towels of absorbent cotton in great new colors. Fluffy, smoke, graphite, alpaca or

Every day, L.A. LIFE
entertains you.

NEWS TIME
Invites Daily News readers to submit ideas and suggestions for stories
Mailing Address: Daily News, P.O. Box 5100, Los Angeles, CA 90051

To subscribe, call free number 800-411-1111

Antelope Valley - (805) 948-8000 Santa Clarita Valley - (805) 253-7000
Burbank - (818) 346-3131 Santa Clarita Valley - (805) 253-7000
Glendale-Foothill - (818) 246-4773 Santa Clarita Valley - (805) 253-7000
Burbank - (818) 346-3131 Santa Clarita Valley - (805) 253-7000
Las Vegas - (602) 496-1138 Santa Clarita Valley - (805) 253-7000
For Circulation Billing Department, call 927-3411

Postpaid only by Daily News Company, 4425 Irvine Blvd., Van Nuys, California 91411. Second class postage paid at Van Nuys, California. Postmaster: Send address changes to Daily News, P.O. Box 5100, Los Angeles, CA 90051.

DAILY NEWS
VOL. 74—NO. 319
(ISSN 0219-8028)

Circulation office: 907-4567
Home delivery rate: \$1.75 per week
Mail subscription rate: \$3.50 per week

Telephone Numbers

Main Office: 907-4157
Advertising: 907-4000
Accounts: 907-4125
Display: 907-4125
Editorial: 907-4125
Circulation: 907-4125
Glendale/Foothill: 907-4125
Las Vegas/Concho: 907-4125
Santa Clarita Valley: 907-4125
Santa Valley: 907-4125
Burbank: 907-4125
Newspaper: 907-4125

REDACTED

MEMORANDUM

TO: Cardinal Manning

FROM: Fr. REDACTED

DATE: September 25, 1984

RE: REDACTED Work REDACTED
home

She is a parishioner at St. Julie's, Newbury Park.

Her son, she says, REDACTED (15 years old) was involved with the Fr. Pat Roemer case.

Presently, he is at Beverly Glen Hospital for REDACTED treatment. He will be released on Sunday. He has many needs and the family is out of funds.

The mother says she did not testify nor her son against Fr. Roemer. They are listed as "uncooperative witnesses". She did not think it good for them or Father Roemer. Would appreciate anything we could do.

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED REDACTED said to me by telephone
that REDACTED REDACTED as a good woman
who they helped straighten out in a second
marriage. She is trying to do the best for
her family according to him & is not a
troublemaker. Fr. REDACTED is her pastor -
REDACTED

6425

Sept. 27, 1984.

Dear Father, ^{REDACTED},

As you suggested this morning in our phone conversation, this letter is a request for financial assistance from the Archdiocese of Los Angeles in order to continue treatment for ^{REDACTED} ^{REDACTED} for my son, ^{REDACTED} at Beverly Glen Hospital. Without your help, treatment will have to stop on September 30, 1984. I believe that if the current treatment is discontinued, ^{REDACTED} will again ^{REDACTED} endangering himself and others. I hope



that you feel as I do that our clear & pressing family need requires your urgent attention).

At the present time our monthly expenses exceed our income by approximately \$300.00. This, of course, does not include REDACTED hospitalization costs. In addition the rest of my REDACTED children, ages REDACTED must due without college, Catholic education and braces. Hopefully, I will soon be able to start payments for my recent surgery. These costs are now over \$1200.00.

In order for REDACTED, who



is ^{REDACTED} years old, to continue
his urgent treatment for
his emotional and psychologi-
cal problems that have
resulted in ^{REDACTED}

I need your financial help.

^{REDACTED} has been under
treatment of some sort since
the early part of 1981 when
he was ^{REDACTED} years old. This
has resulted in our depleting
all benefits available on
three insurance policies.

As you may know, ^{REDACTED}
attended St. Jude's Catholic
Private School in Newbury
Park from 1978 to 1981. ^{REDACTED}

^{REDACTED} apparently
started in late 1980 or
early 1981.



If you have any questions or need any further information, please do not hesitate to call me at home or at work. My telephone numbers are:

home REDACTED

work -

Thank you for your prayers, concern, and personal involvement in our time of need.

Remembering you in my prayers, I am sincerely yours,

REDACTED

REDACTED



Sept. 28, 1984

Statement of Verification

To Whom It May Concern:
REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

Very truly yours,
REDACTED
REDACTED, M.A.

6430

BGH Beverly Glen Hospital

Clinical Therapist 10361 West Pico Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90064 • (213)

BGI+ Beverly Glen Hospital

10361 West Pico Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90064

REDACTED

6431

1 REDACTED

2

3

4

5

Attorneys for Defendant, ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF LOS
ANGELES, A Corporation Sole, ST. PASCHAL'S PARISH.

6

7

8

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

9

FOR THE COUNTY OF VENTURA

10 REDACTED

11

) CASE NO.: 82750

12

) ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS'
) FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT.

13

14

15

16

17

Plaintiffs,)

18

vs.)

19

ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF
LOS ANGELES, a California
Corporation; ARCHDIOCESE OF
LOS ANGELES, EDUCATION AND
WELFARE CORPORATION, a
California Corporation;
PATRICK ROEMER; FATHER COLM
O'RYAN; ST. PASCHAL BAYLON
CATHOLIC CHURCH; an unincor-
porated association; and DOES
1 through 50, inclusive,

6416

25

Defendants.)

26

27

TO EACH OF THE PLAINTIFFS HEREIN AND REDACTED

28

REDACTED THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

1 COMES NOW, Defendant, ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF
2 LOS ANGELES, a corporation sole, who answers on behalf of
3 itself and on behalf on St. Paschal's Parish, in that the
4 Roman Catholic Archbishop conducts part of its affairs under
5 the name of St. Paschal's Parish, ("answering Defendant") and
6 answers the First Amended Complaint on file herein as follows:
7

8 1. The First Amended Complaint in the above-entitled
9 action being unverified, this answering Defendant, pursuant
10 to §431.30 (d) of the Code of Civil Procedure, denies generally
11 and specifically each and every allegation contained in the
12 First Amended Complaint and further denies that Plaintiffs
13 have been injured or damaged in the sums alleged or in any
14 other sum or sums, or at all.
15

16 FOR A FIRST, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE
17 DEFENSE TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED
18 COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:
19

20 2. The First Amended Complaint, and each and every
21 cause of action contained therein, fails to state a cause of
22 action against this answering Defendant under any legal theory.
23

24 FOR A SECOND, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE
25 DEFENSE TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT,
26 ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES UPON INFORMATION AND BELIEF:
27

28 3. Any and all events and happenings in connection

1 with the allegations contained in the First Amended Complaint
2 were proximately caused and contributed to by the negligence and
3 other legal fault of Plaintiffs and were further proximately
4 caused and contributed to by the negligence and other legal
5 fault of persons and entities other than this answering
6 Defendant and that if Plaintiffs recover any sum whatsoever
7 herein, such amount must be reduced in proportion to the
8 extent that Plaintiffs' own negligence and other legal fault
9 proximately caused and contributed to Plaintiffs' claimed
10 injuries and damages, and that if there is a verdict in favor
11 of said Plaintiffs against this Defendant, said verdict
12 should be in proportion to this answering Defendant's pro
13 rata responsibility and to the extent that it is necessary,
14 this answering Defendant may be entitled to partial indemnity
15 from others on a comparative fault basis.

16
17 FOR A THIRD, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE
18 DEFENSE TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED
19 COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

20
21 4. Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint on file
22 herein fails to state a cause of action against this answering
23 Defendant in that it is barred by the Statute of Limitations,
24 California Code of Civil Procedure §340.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

6418

1 FOR A FOURTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE
2 DEFENSE TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT,
3 ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES UPON INFORMATION AND BELIEF:
4

5 5. At the time that Defendant, PATRICK ROEMER,
6 allegedly engaged in assault and battery against Plaintiffs
7 as alleged in Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, he was
8 acting with the consent of Plaintiffs and therefore is not
9 liable to Plaintiffs.

10
11 FOR A FIFTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE
12 DEFENSE TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED
13 COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:
14

15 At the time that Defendant, PATRICK ROEMER, allegedly
16 engaged in the alleged tortious acts of which Plaintiffs
17 complain, he was not acting within the course and scope of
18 any employment with this answering Defendant.

19
20 FOR A SIXTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE
21 DEFENSE TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT,
22 ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES UPON INFORMATION AND BELIEF:
23

24 This answering Defendant's alleged actions and
25 conduct throughout the period of time referred to in Plaintiffs'
26 First Amended Complaint were not intentional nor unreasonable
27 and therefore this answering Defendant is in no way responsible
28 for any alleged emotional distress allegedly suffered by

1 Plaintiffs.

2

3

FOR A SEVENTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE

4

DEFENSE TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT,

5

ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES UPON INFORMATION AND BELIEF:

6

7

This answering Defendant at no time throughout the
8 period of time referred to in Plaintiffs' First Amended
9 Complaint ratified or otherwise approved either expressly or
10 impliedly the alleged tortious acts of Defendant, PATRICK
11 ROEMER of which Plaintiffs complain.

12

13

FOR A EIGHTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE

14

DEFENSE TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED

15

COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

16

17

Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint fails to state
18 facts sufficient for a cause of action for punitive damages
19 against this answering Defendant.

20

///

21

///

22

///

23

///

24

///

25

///

26

///

27

///

28

///

6420

1 FOR A NINTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE
2 DEFENSE TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED
3 COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:
4

5 Plaintiff, REDACTED First Amended Complaint
6 fails to state facts sufficient for a cause of action for
7 breach of contract against this answering Defendant.
8

9 FOR A TENTH, SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE
10 DEFENSE TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT,
11 ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES UPON INFORMATION AND BELIEF:
12

13 At all times mentioned in the First Amended
14 Complaint, the parents and/or guardians of Plaintiffs,
15 REDACTED
16 REDACTED so carelessly, recklessly and negligently conducted
17 and maintained themselves so as to cause and contribute in
18 some way to the alleged incidents and to the damages, if any
19 alleged to have been sustained by Plaintiffs. Therefore,
20 Plaintiffs' recovery herein as to any damage and injuries
21 suffered by Plaintiffs, if any, shall be diminished to the
22 extent that such injury or damages were proximately caused
23 by the negligence of the parents and/or guardians of said
24 Plaintiffs.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

6421

1 WHEREFORE, this answering Defendant prays that
2 Plaintiffs take nothing by reason of their Complaint, and
3 that this answering Defendant be given judgment for costs
4 incurred, to be incurred, and for such other and further
5 relief as the court may deem just and proper.

6
7 DATED: October 4, 1984 REDACTED

8 REDACTED
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

6422

VERIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF

I have read the foregoing _____ and know its contents.

☒ CHECK APPLICABLE PARAGRAPH☐ I am a party to this action. The matters stated in the foregoing document are true of my own knowledge except as to those matters which are stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true.☐ I am ☐ an Officer ☐ a partner _____ ☐ a _____ of _____a party to this action, and am authorized to make this verification for and on its behalf, and I make this verification for that reason. ☐ I am informed and believe and on that ground allege that the matters stated in the foregoing document are true. ☐ The matters stated in the foregoing document are true of my own knowledge except as to those matters which are stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true.☐ I am one of the attorneys for _____, a party to this action. Such party is absent from the county of aforesaid where such attorneys have their offices, and I make this verification for and on behalf of that party for that reason. I am informed and believe and on that ground allege that the matters stated in the foregoing document are true.

Executed on _____, 19____, at _____ California.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Type or Print Name_____
SignatureACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT OF DOCUMENT
(other than summons and complaint)

Received copy of document described as _____

on _____ 19____.

Type or Print Name_____
Signature

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California.I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action: my business address is: _____
REDACTED Los Angeles, California 90017On 10/4 1984, I served the foregoing document described as _____
ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT_____ on interested parties

in this action by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:

REDACTED

6423

☒ (BY MAIL) I caused such envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid to be placed in the United States mail at Los Angeles, California.Executed on 10/4 1984, at Los Angeles, California.☐ (BY PERSONAL SERVICE) I caused such envelope to be delivered by hand to the offices of the addressee.

Executed on _____, 19____, at _____, California.

☒ (State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.☐ (Federal) I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made.
REDACTED

REDACTED

Type or Print Name

1 REDACTED

2

3

4

5

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

6

7

8

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

9

COUNTY OF VENTURA

10

11

REDACTED

Case No. 82750

12

13

14

PLAINTIFF REDACTED
REDACTED RESPONSES TO
INTERROGATORIES (SET ONE)
BY AND THROUGH HIS
GUARDIAN AD LITEM
REDACTED

15

16

17

18

PLAINTIFFS,

19

vs.

20

ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF
LOS ANGELES, a California
Corporation; ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS
ANGELES, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
CORPORATION, a California
Corporation; PATRICK ROEMER;
FATHER COLM O'RYAN; ST. PASCHAL
BAYLON CATHOLIC CHURCH; an
unincorporated association; and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

21

22

23

24

25

Defendant.

26

27

28

1 Interrogatory #1

2 (A) Saint John's Seminary, Camarillo, Father ROEMER
3 informed the church officials of his pedophilia and attraction to
4 young males. He confided with Father REDACTED at the Santa Barbara
5 Parish about his behavior. Father COLM O'RYAN was informed by
6 REDACTED on or about December 27, 1980 of Father ROEMER's
7 molestation of REDACTED which took place in May of 1980.
8 Discovery is continuing and at this point these are the known
9 sources for the statement in paragraph eight of the First Amended
10 Complaint.

11 (B) The information was given to Father O'RYAN on or about
12 December 27, 1980. Father ROEMER's statements at Saint John's
13 Seminary were made during his stay there; his statements to
14 Father REDACTED were made between 1970 and 1978.

15 (C) Information relating to Father REDACTED and the Seminary
16 was obtained during the time that Father ROEMER was being
17 prosecuted by the Ventura County District Attorney's Office.
18 Information was learned first hand from REDACTED about
19 her statements to Father O'RYAN.

20 (D) Father ROEMER has knowledge of all of the allegations;
21 Father O'RYAN of course took part in the discussions with
22 REDACTED all Plaintiffs in this lawsuit as well as their
23 parents; persons who were involved in the District Attorney's
24 prosecution of Father ROEMER.

25 (E) Documents contained in the District Attorney's file
26 concerning the prosecution of Father ROEMER.

27 (F) N/A
28

1 Interrogatory #2

2 (A) REDACTED , and REDACTED went to SAINT PASCHAL's and
3 personally spoke with Father O'RYAN on or about December 27,
4 1980, and Father O'RYAN personally questioned REDACTED about the
5 molestation which was reported by REDACTED and REDACTED
6 Father O'RYAN assured Mrs. REDACTED that the matter would be taken
7 care of.

8 (B) The entire REDACTED family, Father O'RYAN, Father
9 ROEMER, all have knowledge of what went on in the visit. All
10 Plaintiffs and their families have knowledge coming from Mrs.
11 REDACTED REDACTED address REDACTED in Exton, Pennsylvania
12 19341, has knowledge of the meeting between Father O'RYAN and the
13 REDACTED after having spoken with Father O'RYAN in February of
14 1981.

15 Interrogatory #3

16 (A) I doubt if anyone would consent to the assault. As far
17 as knowledge of the assault, it would be after Defendant ROEMER's
18 arrest. The church and ARCHDIOCESE as well as the arresting
19 persons were informed. Father O'RYAN knew Father ROEMER had
20 molested previously and had the opportunity to remove him from
21 his duties to guard against further incidents. Father REDACTED and a
22 priest in Santa Barbara knew of Father ROEMER's pedophilia.

23 (B) January 26, and January 27, 1981 when Father ROEMER was
24 arrested.

25 (C) Unknown except for Father ROEMER and REDACTED

26 (D) Documents in the District Attorney's file

27 (E) None other than documents in the District Attorney's
28 file.

1 Interrogatory #4

2 (A) REDACTED who was the first molest victim to step forward,
 3 and have Father ROEMER taken away from the other children,
 4 endured a tremendous burden. He had mixed feelings at first,
 5 because he did not want to get Father ROEMER in trouble. Because
 6 of our good family relationship, he was able to describe what
 7 happened, and felt guilty about it. He suffered severely
 8 mentally, and was very nervous about the events. He was
 9 humiliated because it happened to him, and he was paranoid
 10 everyone would find out about it. We keep it as quiet as
 11 possible. But the articles in the paper gave REDACTED mother's
 12 name, and again, he had to hear about this at school. It
 13 affected him. Our main concern is the emotional or sexual
 14 problems that he faces in the future.

15 (B) Humiliation, paranoia, fear, guilt. see 4(A)
 1 REDACTED

1'

18 REDACTED Counselor, the visit took place shortly after the
 19 arrest, in February 1981. REDACTED psychologist, \$330, March
 20 1982, REDACTED
 21 REDACTED REDACTED was
 22 also tested to determine his academic progress which was slipping
 23 at the time, as well as on his adjustment and reassurance about
 24 his name being spread around town. Total expenditures
 25 approximately \$425.00

26 (D) N/A

27 (E) N/A

28

1 Interrogatory #5

2 (A) REDACTED has also expressed that because of this incident,
3 he could possibly become "gay" when he grows up, he asked me
4 about six months ago, and also asked me that today. We know that
5 he will never forget the molest, and wonder how he will feel
6 about it as he grows up. There is always a possibility that
7 therapy will be needed in the future as he develops sexually.

8 (B) Testing, \$330.00; visit in March, 1984-\$65.00; visit
9 for REDACTED parents-1981-\$30

10 (C) Please refer to answer to interrogatory 4(C)

11 (D) Unknown

12 (E) N/A

13 (F) N/A

14 Interrogatory #6

15 (A) During his interview with REDACTED after his
16 arrest, Father ROEMER stated that he lured REDACTED into his office
17 to look at a year book. That is a malicious and totally
18 irresponsible act, because intentions before entering that room
19 were to fondle our son, whom he had taken advantage of.

20 (B) None other than those in the District Attorney's file

21 (C) None other than those in the District Attorney's file

22 Interrogatory #7

23 (A) Please see answer to interrogatory 4(C)

24 (B) See interrogatory answer 4(C) and 5(B)

25 (C) REDACTED mother and father, REDACTED

REDACTED

26 REDACTED Exton, Pennsylvania 19341, telephone REDACTED

27 (D) Please see answer to interrogatory 5(A)

28 (E) N/A

1 Interrogatory #8

2 (A) Again, I have described REDACTED emotional distress in
3 answers above. Please see answer to 4(A)

4 (B) Please see 4(C) and 5(B)

5 (C) His parents, REDACTED address above

6 Interrogatory #9

7 (A) Father O'RYAN had been told previously of Father
8 ROEMER's molestation of REDACTED . In spite of that, Father
9 ROEMER was allowed to continue working children in the parish.
10 Father ROEMER intended to molest REDACTED

11 (B) Father O'RYAN, Father ROEMER, discovery is continuing
12 at this time.

13 (C) Medical damages outlined above.

14 (D) Father O'RYAN, Father ROEMER, REDACTED

15 (E) Documents in the District Attorney's file

16 (F) Documents in the District Attorney's file.

17 Interrogatory #10

18 (A) Father ROEMER had a duty as a priest to protect the
19 well-being and safety of young boys which he failed to do.
20 Father O'RYAN had a duty to protect parishioners from Father
21 ROEMER's molestations.

22 (B) Defendants' had a duty to provide for REDACTED safety
23 including making sure that church personnel would be fit for
24 providing for the needs of minor parishioners. Father ROEMER's
25 molestation of REDACTED and retaining Father ROEMER in his church
26 position after notice to the church of REDACTED
27 molestation were breaches of Defendants' duty of care.
28

1 (C) Father ROEMER, Father O'RYAN. Father O'RYAN breached
2 said duty of care on and after December 27, 1980 in allowing
3 Father ROEMER to remain in his church position. Father ROEMER
4 continually breached his duty of care by molesting young male
5 parishioners.

6 (D) Father O'RYAN, Father ROEMER, REDACTED discovery is
7 continuing at this time.

8 (E) District Attorney's files.

9 (F) District Attorney's files.

10 Interrogatory #11

11 (A) Please see answer to 4(A) and previous descriptions of
12 REDACTED; mental condition.

13 (B) Please see medical personnel identified above

14 (C) Please see itemization above

15 (D) District Attorney's file

16 (E) District Attorney's file

17 Interrogatory #12

18 (A) Again, I have previously described REDACTED; humiliation,
19 paranoia, fear, guilt, and other indications of his emotional
20 distress. Please read those answers above.

21 (B) Please see answers to 4(A) and 5(B)

22 (C) REDACTED family, REDACTED and REDACTED

23 (D) District Attorney's file

24 (E) District Attorney's file

25 Interrogatory #13

26 (A) Father REDACTED had been notified while Father ROEMER was
27 at that Santa Barbara Parish; Father O'RYAN had been notified on
28 December 17, 1980 about Father ROEMER's molestation of REDACTED

1 REDACTED various counselors and psychologists had been told of
2 Father ROEMER'S pedophilia by Father ROEMER himself.

3 (B) The notification to counselors and psychologists, facts
4 unknown at this time; REDACTED and REDACTED told Father
5 O'Ryan at St. Paschal's Parrish on December 27, 1980; Father REDACTED
6 was told during Father Roemer's stay in Santa Barbara.

7 (C) Father O'RYAN, Father REDACTED of Sacred Heart
8 Church, Saticoy, was told by police officials in late December,
9 1980, Father REDACTED as indicated above.

10 (D) REDACTED was notified by the Ventura County
11 Police Department in late December 1980, REDACTED spoke
12 to Father O'Ryan on December 27, 1980, other date unknown.

13 (E) District Attorney's file.

14 (F) District Attorney's file.

15 Interrogatory #14

16 (A) Please see previous description of REDACTED; mental
17 state, specifically 4(A).

18 (B) REDACTED family, REDACTED

19 (C) Identified above.

20 (D) Identified above.

21 (E) District Attorney's file.

22 (F) District Attorney's file.

23 Interrogatory #15

24 (A) St. Paschal's continued to employ Father Roemer after
25 they had been notified that Father Roemer had molested REDACTED
26 REDACTED

27 (B) Medical damages outlined above.
28

1 (C) REDACTED family, REDACTED

2 (D) District Attorney's file.

3 Dated: December 20, 1984 REDACTED

4 REDACTED

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

(VERIFICATION—446, 2015.5 C. C. P.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF

I am the Plaintiff

Plaintiff REDACTED
in the above entitled action or proceeding; I have read the foregoing

Responses to Interrogatories (Set One)

and know the contents thereof; and I certify that the same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated upon my information or belief, and as to those matters I believe it to be true.

I declare, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on 11.20.84 at CAMARILLO, California

REDACTED

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL (1013a, 2015.5 C. C. P.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF

I am a resident of the county aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within entitled action; my business address is:

REDACTED

On December 20, 19 84, I served the within documents

on the parties
in said action, by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Camarillo addressed as follows:

BY PERSONAL SERVICE TO: 12/21/84
REDACTED

Patrick Roemer
REDACTED

6500

I declare, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on 12/20/84 at Camarillo, California
(date) (initial)

REDACTED

REDACTED

Type or Print Name

1 Interrogatory #1

2 (A) Saint John's Seminary, Camarillo, Father ROEMER
3 informed the church officials of his pedophilia and
4 attraction to young males. He confided with Father REDACTED at
5 the Santa Barbara Parish about his behavior. Father COLM
6 O'RYAN was informed by REDACTED on or about December
7 27, 1980 of Father ROEMER's molestation of REDACTED
8 which took place in May of 1980. Discovery is continuing
9 and at this point these are the known sources for the
10 statement in paragraph eight of the First Amended Complaint.

11 (B) The information was given to Father O'RYAN on or
12 about December 27, 1980. Father ROEMER's statements at
13 Saint John's Seminary were made during his stay there; his
14 statements to Father REDACTED were made between 1970 and 1978.

15 (C) Information relating to Father REDACTED, and the
16 Seminary was obtained during the time that Father ROEMER was
17 being prosecuted by the Ventura County District Attorney's
18 Office. Information was learned first hand from REDACTED
19 REDACTED about her statements to Father O'RYAN.

20 (D) Father ROEMER has knowledge of all of the
21 allegations; Father O'RYAN of course took part in the
22 discussions with REDACTED all Plaintiffs in this
23 lawsuit as well as their parents; persons who were involved
24 in the District Attorney's prosecution of Father ROEMER.

25 (E) Documents contained in the District Attorney's
26 file concerning the prosecution of Father ROEMER.

27 (F) Documents contained in the District Attorney's
28 file concerning the prosecution of Father ROEMER.

1 Interrogatory #2

2 (A) REDACTED and REDACTED went to SAINT
3 PASCHAL's and personally spoke with Father O'RYAN on or
4 about December 27, 1980, and Father O'RYAN personally
5 questioned REDACTED about the molestation which was reported by
6 REDACTED; and REDACTED Father O'RYAN assured Mrs.
7 REDACTED that the matter would be taken care of.

8 (B) The entire REDACTED family, Father O'RYAN, Father
9 ROEMER, all have knowledge of what went on in the visit.
10 All Plaintiffs and their families have knowledge coming from
11 Mrs. REDACTED REDACTED address REDACTED in REDACTED
12 REDACTED has knowledge of the meeting between
13 Father O'RYAN and the REDACTED after having spoken with
14 Father O'RYAN in February of 1981.

15 Interrogatory #3

16 (A) I assume that no one had knowledge of the assault
17 of REDACTED prior to the assault; Father ROEMER
18 certainly "had knowledge and consented to" the assault and
19 was associated with Defendant ARCHBISHOP or ARCHDIOCESE.

20 (B) It is unknown at this time when Father O'RYAN or
21 other officials from SAINT PASCHAL's were notified of the
22 assault.

23 (C) Father ROEMER performed the assault on or about
24 January 19, 1981. It is unknown at this time when officials
25 connected with Defendants SAINT PASCHAL's learned of the
26 assault.

27 (D) Father ROEMER and Plaintiff REDACTED
28 Plaintiff's parents were told of the assault afterwards.

1 (E) Documents in the District Attorney's files

2 (F) Father ROEMER performed these assaults while he
3 was in the employ of SAINT PASCHAL's, the ARCHDIOCESE, and
4 the ARCHBISHOP. This was after Father O'RYAN had been
5 informed by REDACTED of the previous molestation.

6 Interrogatory #4

7 (A) REDACTED has suffered damages from this
8 molestation which will be with him indefinitely. First of
9 all, my son REDACTED was assaulted in one of the safest places
10 on this earth, a confessional. The Defendant was a priest,
11 at one of the highest levels of trust, and was respected by
12 our son. REDACTED, for some time, had to endure the
13 embarrassment of his peers. This information was printed in
14 the newspaper. Our son has gone through tremendous mental
15 stress and probably will face more as an adult. He has lost
16 all desires to go back to that parish or any Catholic church
17 because of what happened. This same Defendant, Father
18 ROEMER, was the priest who had recently administered REDACTED
19 first communion. REDACTED is missing the Catholic education and
20 up bringing his parents had planned for him. Mistrust for
21 authority figures, males, and the church are all results of
22 this molestation.

23 (B) REDACTED mother and father, REDACTED
24 REDACTED, REDACTED
25 REDACTED

26 (C) None

27 (D) None

28 Interrogatory #5

1 (A) We do not have a crystal ball, first of all, to
2 predict what lies ahead for ^{REDACTED} and other child molest
3 victims, but know that many such victims develop medical or
4 sexual problems in their teenage years and as adults. It is
5 unknown what lies ahead.

6 (B) None

7 (C) None

8 (D) Parents

9 (E) None

10 (F) None

11 Interrogatory #6

12 (A) Emotional and mental damage, \$350,000.00 (three
13 hundred fifty thousand dollars).

14 (B) None

15 (C) None

16 Interrogatory #7

17 (A) None

18 (B) One cannot break down or itemize damages for
19 emotional or mental distress.

20 (C) Father ROEMER

21 (D) None

22 (E) Documents in the District Attorney's file.

23 Interrogatory #8

24 (A) I have stated in my answer to Interrogatory #4 (A)
25 what general damage has been done to ^{REDACTED} I cannot
26 overemphasize the severity of the mental damage which was
27 done to him by Father ROEMER's molestation.

28 (B) No medical damages to date; general damages

1 \$350,000.00

2 (C) REDACTED parents, Father ROEMER.

3 Interrogatory #9

4 (A) The molestation to REDACTED was carried out after the
5 church had been notified that Father ROEMER had molested

6 REDACTED At the time Father ROEMER carried out this
7 molestation, he was performing a function as Head of
8 Children's Services at SAINT PASCHALS. He was receiving the
9 confession of REDACTED Retaining Father ROEMER at this point
10 in time, after a confirmed report of a molestation as well
11 as confessions by Father ROEMER to Father REDACTED and others of
12 his pedophilia is conduct which is in wanton disregard of
13 REDACTED feelings.

14 (B) Father ROEMER, Father O'RYAN, anyone who was
15 responsible for retaining Father ROEMER in that position.

16 (C) General damages \$350,000.00.

17 (D) Father REDACTED Father ROEMER, Father O'RYAN, REDACTED
18 REDACTED discovery is continuing at this time. REDACTED
19 of Thousand Oaks was told by Father O'Ryan that he had told
20 the Archdiocese of Father Roemer's molest of REDACTED

21 (E) Documents in the District Attorney's file.

22 (F) None known at this time.

23 Interrogatory #10

24 (A) Plaintiff was a minor, and had a special
25 relationship with SAINT PASCHAL'S and Father ROEMER, as well
26 as the Catholic church. Father ROEMER was acting as a
27 servant of God in his duties as a priest, his role allowed
28 him to say mass, hear confession, instruct and counsel

1 adults and young people in his parish. The victims were
2 actively involved in church activities as they had been
3 taught to do. The Defendant owed REDACTED a chance to listen to
4 his confessions without molesting him, and giving him some
5 guidance or a few prayers to say.

6 (B) Defendants had a duty to provide for REDACTED safety
7 including making sure that church personnel would be fit for
8 providing for the needs of minor parishioners. Father
9 ROEMER's molestation of REDACTED retaining Father ROEMER in his
10 church position after notice to the church of REDACTED
11 REDACTED molestation.

12 (C) Objection, calls for a legal conclusion. In the
13 spirit of cooperation the following information is offered;
14 January 19, 1981, Defendant ROEMER's molestation of REDACTED
15 Father O'RYAN's failure to remove Father ROEMER from his
16 position of dealing with children after notice by REDACTED
17 REDACTED of REDACTED molestation. Discovery is
18 continuing at this time, and should Plaintiff secure
19 Further information, it will be provided to Defendant.

20 (D) Father O'RYAN, Father ROEMER, each Plaintiff in
21 this lawsuit and their parents.

22 (E) Arrest report, statements by Defendant to District
23 Attorney, victims' statements to District Attorney
24 representatives.

25 (F) None at this time
26 Interrogatory #11

27 (A) Please refer to my answer to Interrogatory #4(A) I
28 have described the suffering which REDACTED as undergone. He

1 has been humiliated and constantly fearful that others will
2 find out about this molestation.

3 (B) None

4 (C) \$350,000.00

5 (D) None other than documents in the District
6 Attorney's file.

7 (E) None other than documents in the District
8 Attorney's file.

9 Interrogatory #12

10 (A) Again, I have outlined the damage in my answer to
11 Interrogatory #4(A). Again that emotional distress is
12 accompanied by a loss of faith and a loss of the family
13 closeness associated with sharing our religion and going to
14 church functions.

15 (B) See answer to Interrogatory #4(A)

16 (C) Parents, Mr. and Mrs. REDACTED

17 (D) Documents in the District Attorney's file.

18 (E) Documents in the District Attorney's file.

19 Interrogatory #13

20 (A) Father ROEMER had been admitting his pedophilia
21 ever since he had attended seminary. He had sought
22 counseling for it with church members; Father O'RYAN had
23 been notified by REDACTED initially on December 27,
24 1980, that Father ROEMER had committed a severe molestation
25 of REDACTED in May of 1980. Father O'RYAN did nothing
26 about this notice, and continued to place Father ROEMER in a
27 position where he could come in contact with minors. Father
28 REDACTED of Sacred Heart Church in Saticoy was told

1 by police authorities of Father Roemer's molestation of
2 REDACTED in late December 1983; nothing was done. Father REDACTED
3 Father O'RYAN; discovery is continuing at this time.

4 (D) The dates of notification to Father REDACTED are
5 unknown, nor is the manner. REDACTED spoke with
6 Father O'RYAN on December 27, 1980.

7 (E) Documents connected with the District Attorney
8 investigation.

9 (F) Documents in connection with the District
10 Attorney's investigation.

11 (G) None known at this time

12 Interrogatory #14

13 (A) REDACTED remains fearful that others might find out
14 about the molestation, he cried repeatedly about the
15 incident; he has lost his church and a certain part of his
16 family life.

17 (B) His parents are witnesses to all

18 (C) None

19 (D) None

20 (E) None other than victims' statements and letters
21 written by victims' parents.

22 (F) None known at this time

23 Interrogatory #15

24 (A) The answer to this question is the same as
25 contained in answer to Interrogatory #4(A). Plaintiff has
26 suffered that emotional wrenching and it has scarred him for
27 life.

28 (B) \$350,000.00 in general damages

1 (C) His parents

2 (D) None other than letters or documents contained in
3 the District Attorney's file.

4 Dated: December 18, 1984

5 REDACTED

6 REDACTED

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

6486

(VERIFICATION—446, 2015.5 C. C. P.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF

I am the Plaintiffin the above entitled action or proceeding; I have read the foregoing Plaintiff REDACTEDNiemann's Responses to Interrogatories (Set One)

and know the contents thereof; and I certify that the same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated upon my information or belief, and as to those matters I believe it to be true.

I declare, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on 11.20.84 at CAMARILLO, California
 (date) (place)

REDACTED

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL (1013a, 2015.5 C. C. P.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF

I am a resident of the county aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within entitled action; my business address is:

REDACTED

On 12/20/84, 19____, I served the within documents

on the interested parties

in said action, by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Camarillo, California addressed as follows:

Patrick Roemer
 REDACTED

BY PERSONAL SERVICE: (12/21/84)
 REDACTED

6487

I declare, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on 12/20/84 at Camarillo, California
 (date) (place)

REDACTED

REDACTED

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REDACTED

RECEIVED

DEC 21 1984

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

REDACTED

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF VENTURA

REDACTED

) Case No. 82750
)
)
)
)
)
)
) PLAINTIFF REDACTED
) REDACTED RESPONSES TO
) INTERROGATORIES (SET ONE)
) BY AND THROUGH HIS
) GUARDIAN AD LITEM
) REDACTED

Plaintiffs,

vs.

ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF
LOS ANGELES, a California
Corporation; ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS
ANGELES, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
CORPORATION, a California
Corporation; PATRICK ROEMER;
FATHER COLM O'RYAN; ST. PASCHAL
BAYLON CATHOLIC CHURCH; an
unincorporated association; and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

/

/

1 Interrogatory #1

2 (A) Father ^{REDACTED} at the Santa Barbara parish at which Father
3 ROEMER was employed from 1970 until 1978; Unknown
4 psychologist/counselor employed by the Catholic church, others
5 unknown at this time; discovery is continuing.

6 (B) Father ^{REDACTED} -1970-1978; dates of counselors unknown

7 (C) District Attorney's investigation

8 (D) Unknown

9 (E) District Attorney's file

10 (F) District Attorney's file

11 Interrogatory #2

12 (A) REDACTED and REDACTED told Father O'RYAN
13 on December 27, 1980 at SAINT PASCHAL's of Father ROEMER's
14 molestation of ^{REDACTED} in May of 1980.

15 (B) Father ^{REDACTED} ^{ED} REDACTED

16 Interrogatory #3

17 (A) Father ROEMER

18 (B) Between June 16 and June 26, 1980

19 (C) Father ROEMER, REDACTED

20 (D) Documents in the District Attorney's file

21 (E) Documents in the District Attorney's file

22 Interrogatory #4

23 (A) From the first day of the sports camp, my son ^{REDACTED} was
24 extremely frightened by Father ROEMER. He begged us to let him
25 quit after the first day because Father ROEMER had been bothering
26 him over a time period from October 9, 1978 until the beginning
27 of the sports camp in June of 1980.

28 I had always been present, so I made sure that nothing

1 really terrible happened. Never the less, REDACTED was always afraid
2 of Father ROEMER, and whenever he encountered him (at football
3 games) REDACTED rushed over to me and said, "Don't leave, that 'gay'
4 priest is after us all." When my husband and I discussed the
5 fact that REDACTED was harassed and frightened by Father ROEMER, and
6 wanted to quit the sports camp, we decided that since the \$60.00
7 non-refundable fee had been paid in advance, we would have REDACTED
8 attend anyway, but due to the problem with Father ROEMER, I would
9 not work, and would be there, at least when the camp over for the
10 day. We thought that REDACTED would be safe during the actual
11 sporting events. But, Father ROEMER did not let anything stop
12 him. He came after REDACTED on the field, grabbing him, and holding
13 him, and telling him, "You can't get away...you have such a nice
14 body...I want you to come to my room and see some pictures."

15 (B) Plaintiff was afraid that Father ROEMER would come and
16 get him, I could not work for over a year due to the fact that
17 REDACTED insisted that I not leave him, REDACTED insisted that he not be
18 on the second floor of the house alone; his problems were
19 unbelievable.

20 (C) General damages \$350,000.00.

21 (D) None

22 (E) None

23 Interrogatory #5

24 (A) We do not know whether REDACTED will need future medical
25 care as a result of this molestation.

26 (B) None

27 (C) None

28 (D) Family

1 (E) None

2 (F) None

3 Interrogatory #6

4 (A) I was a witness to Father ROEMER's actions with young
5 boys from October 1978 until June 1980 on various occasions. My
6 husband, my son^{REDACTED} and I all agreed that what Father ROEMER
7 tried to pass off as affection was way beyond the norm. He would
8 approach young boys, hug them to him, and rub and fondle them,
9 all the time while the boys would struggle to get free. He went
10 from one boy to another. It gave you a weird feeling to watch
11 this going on. It served to frighten our child^{REDACTED} and you
12 could see the other boys get out of Father ROEMER's way when he
13 happened upon the scene. The boys would go over and stand next
14 to their parents on the sidelines at football games. At the
15 sports camp, I watched Father ROEMER literally hold captive boy
16 after boy. The children where clearly either fearful or annoyed,
17 or both.

18 (B) None

19 (C) None

20 Interrogatory #7

21 (A) None

22 (B) General damages \$350,000.00

23 (C) His family

24 (D) None, other than those in the District Attorney's file

25 (E) None, other than those in the District Attorney's file

26 Interrogatory #8

27 (A) ^{REDACTED} spent the year 1980 from June on being so fearful
28 that he could not be left alone. This is a boy of age 12--most

1 12 year old boys are able to be left for periods of time. REDACTED
2 would not go to the second floor of our house alone. He would
3 play outside with neighbor children because he was afraid "that
4 priest will come and get me". REDACTED was wakeful in the night, had
5 nightmares and openly was mistrustful of men with whom he came in
6 contact.

7 After Father ROEMER's arrest and when we came forth, REDACTED
8 was extremely frightened that Father ROEMER would come and "beat
9 me up". He thought Father ROEMER knew where he lived because of
10 the sports camp application. REDACTED was afraid to testify because
11 "maybe he'll jump up there in court and get me". REDACTED stayed
12 frightened until age 14 or so when he got a lot larger. He would
13 say "I'll be able to beat up Father ROEMER now, I am bigger than
14 he is". He told us, however, "I'll never trust a male teacher, a
15 coach or a scout master. They could be like Father PAT".

16 He has stated "I'll never let my guard down...I don't trust
17 men very much...I need to be strong to be able to fight a man if
18 he is a fag like Father PAT".

19 (C) General damages \$350,000.00

20 (D) Immediate family

21 (E) District Attorney's file

22 (F) District Attorney's file

23 Interrogatory #10

24 (A) I believe a priest should hold himself up as an
25 example. SAINT PASCHAL's and Father O'RYAN should have provided
26 for the safety of children at the sports camp. No adults should
27 betray the innocence of a child.

28 (B) REDACTED is emotionally damaged by Father ROEMER's actions.

1 (C) The church authorities at SAINT PASCHAL's should not
2 have let Father ROEMER work around young children.

3 (D) Immediate family

4 (E) District Attorney's file

5 (F) District Attorney's file

6 Interrogatory #11

7 (A) A priest is first an authority figure and second a
8 clergymen. Father ROEMER betrayed the innocence of young
9 children. This is inexcusable.

10 (B) None

11 (C) REDACTED, mother lost \$20,000.00 in wages by not being
12 able to work for a year because REDACTED could not be left alone.

13 General damages \$350,00.00

14 (D) District Attorney's file

15 (E) District Attorney's file

16 Interrogatory #12

17 (A) REDACTED mistrusts adult men; he is hesitant to form any
18 relationship with men. He won't speak about the incident with
19 his friends. He is ashamed of what happened and blames himself
20 to some extent.

21 (B) This answer is the same as those above dealing with
22 REDACTED emotional distress.

23 (C) Immediate family

24 (D) District Attorney's file

25 (E) District Attorney's file

26 Interrogatory #13

27 (A) Father ROEMER's actions were so blatant that someone
28 from the church must have known. Father REDACTED in Santa Barbara

1 knew, as did counselors.

2 (B) Exact details of notification are unknown at this time.

3

4 (C) Father REDACTED otherwise unknown.

5 (D) Unknown

6 (E) District Attorney's file

7 (F) District Attorney's file

8 Interrogatory #14

9 (A) If Father ROEMER had been stopped, REDACTED would not have
10 suffered as he had. His suffering is outlined above.

11 (B) Immediate family

12 (C) None

13 (D) \$20,000.00 lost wages, \$350,000.00 general damages

14 (E) District Attorney's file

15 (F) District Attorney's file

16 Interrogatory #15

17 (A) Please see statements above regarding REDACTED emotional
18 distress.

19 (B) \$20,000.00 lost wages, \$350,000.00 general damages

20 (C) Immediate family

21 (D) District Attorney's file

22 Dated: December 20, 1984 REDACTED

23 REDACTED

24

25

26

27

28

(VERIFICATION—446, 2015.5 C. C. P.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF

I am the one of the Plaintiffs

in the above entitled action or proceeding; I have read the foregoing Answers to Interrogatories
Propounded to Plaintiff REDACTED by and through his Guardian

ad Litem REDACTED (Set One)
and know the contents thereof; and I certify that the same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which
are therein stated upon my information or belief, and as to those matters I believe it to be true.

I declare, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

X Executed on Nov 30, 1984 at Thousand Oaks, California
(date) (place)

REDACTED
REDACTED
Type or Print Name

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL (1013a, 2015.5 C. C. P.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF

I am a resident of the county aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within entitled
action, my business address is:

REDACTED

On 12/20/84, 19 , I served the within documents

on the interested parties
in said action, by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the
United States mail at Camarillo, CA
addressed as follows:

BY PERSONAL DELIVERY TO: (12/21/84)

PATRICK ROEMER
REDACTED REDACTED

6473

I declare, under penalty of perjury under the law of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on 12/20/84 at Camarillo, California

REDACTED REDACTED

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REDACTED

RECEIVED

DEC 21 1984

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

REDACTED

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF VENTURA

REDACTED

) Case No. 82750
)
)
)
)
)
) PLAINTIFF REDACTED
) REDACTED RESPONSES TO
) INTERROGATORIES (SET ONE)
) BY AND THROUGH HIS
) GUARDIAN AD LITEM
) REDACTED

Plaintiffs,

vs.

ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF
LOS ANGELES, a California
Corporation; ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS
ANGELES, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
CORPORATION, a California
Corporation; PATRICK ROEMER;
FATHER COLM O'RYAN; ST. PASCHAL
BAYLON CATHOLIC CHURCH; an
unincorporated association; and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendant.

/

/

1 Interrogatory #1

2 (A) Father ^{REDACTED} at the Santa Barbara Parish, persons at
3 Saint John's Seminary in Camarillo; discovery is continuing at
4 this time.

5 (B) Dates unknown

6 (C) From the District Attorney's investigation

7 (D) Father ^{REDACTED} unknown at this time; discovery is
8 continuing

9 (E) District Attorney's file

10 (F) District Attorney's file

11 Interrogatory #2

12 (A) I, REDACTED telephoned Father O'RYAN at SAINT
13 PASCHAL's parish and requested an appointment to see him. I
14 advised him over the telephone that this concerned the molesting
15 of my son by Father ROEMER. ^{REDACTED} and I went that day, December
16 27, 1980, to Father O'RYAN's office at SAINT PASHCAL's and we
17 spoke for a considerable length of time, approximately one hour.
18 I explained to Father O'RYAN the circumstances of ^{REDACTED} having
19 finally admitted what Father ROEMER had done to him, and Father
20 O'RYAN questioned ^{REDACTED} to great lengths. ^{REDACTED} was very
21 embarrassed and uncomfortable, but answered all questions put to
22 him. It was not a pleasant ordeal for him, but I felt that it
23 was necessary for Father O'RYAN to have the opportunity to talk
24 to ^{REDACTED} since his first hand testimony was shattering and
25 should have had an effect on Father O'RYAN.

26 Two of the statements that I particularly remember Father
27 O'RYAN making at the time helped to ease my mind that the
28 situation would be remedied, and a third statement assured me

1 that my church would assume responsibility for seeing that REDACTED
2 got the help he needed so badly. The first statement was that
3 REDACTED should realize that just as there were bad people in other
4 jobs so there are bad men in the priesthood, but not many.
5 Father O'RYAN stated further the it would be like finding a
6 sliver in your finger. If you dig it out, the wound would heal,
7 but if you ignored it, it would just get worse. Father O'RYAN
8 stated that he would "take care of the problem" referring to
9 Father ROEMER.

10 When advised of the radical personality changes REDACTED had
11 undergone since the retreat, REDACTED obvious need for help was
12 discussed. Father O'RYAN stated that he would help us to obtain
13 psychological counseling. He said that there were two avenues
14 that he wanted to check out and that he would give us a call as
15 soon as possible with an answer. The two avenues which he
16 mentioned were a private therapist who was a member of the parish
17 at SAINT PASCHAL's, and Catholic Social Services. Father O'RYAN
18 never called us back and when I finally did get in touch with
19 him, he was very brief and not nearly as open with me. Father
20 O'RYAN informed me that his hands were tied and he would not be
21 able to help us.

22 (B) Father REDACTED and myself.

23 Interrogatory #3

24 (A) Father ROEMER, other persons unknown at this time

25 (B) Mother's day, 1980

26 (C) REDACTED was the victim, Father ROEMER was the
27 perpetrator; REDACTED family is aware of the incident; persons
28 from the District Attorney's Office in Ventura County are aware

1 of the incident through investigation.

2 (D) None other than papers in the District Attorney's file.

3 (E) None other than papers in the District Attorney's file.

4 Interrogatory #4

5 (A) REDACTED has no close friends. He has never been invited
6 to another boy's home to spend the night. He does not get
7 invited to the birthday parties of his school mates. He refuses
8 to go to church, and only occasionally attends when pressured
9 into it. His self esteem is so low that it would be difficult to
10 believe that he is classified by the school district as "gifted"
11 and is on the varsity city basketball team. He does not see
12 himself as bright or talented. His therapy has only been
13 moderately successful. He feels that the therapists have been
14 more interested in the money they get from talking to him than
15 from helping him. This cynical attitude is typical of his
16 personality today, as it has changed since the molestation.

17 REDACTED personality changed after the molestation. He was once a
18 happy, lighthearted child and became a destructive, defiant and
19 antisocial person.

20 (B) REDACTED has buried his ability to make friends. He has
21 lost the friendship of his father. He has frequent nightmares,
22 and talks in his sleep. When his mother goes in to calm him and
23 wake him, he is troubled and confused. He says that he does not
24 remember the dreams the next morning, but these episodes are
25 always followed by days of depression and anger.

26 After the names of the victim's families were printed in the
27 newspaper, REDACTED was afraid to leave the house. He wanted to
28 stay away from the basketball game he had the next day. I

1 insisted that he go, and was probably wrong in doing so, as the
2 boys on his team questioned him and stared at him. REDACTED is
3 extremely moody now, and very cynical. When he discusses kissing
4 or loving on television he scorns or ridicules it or laughs at
5 it. He has lost the desire and even willingness to go to church
6 unless forced. He is very frightened of starting Jr. high school
7 next year and is afraid of older boys.

8 One brief example can explain what his opinion of himself is
9 like. Although he is one of the top five basketball players in
10 his age group in the city, REDACTED was amazed when one of the
11 younger boys asked him to meet him at the park to practice
12 shooting hoops before the tryouts this month. This is a boy
13 REDACTED has known for five years who is nearly a year younger than
14 REDACTED and a grade behind him. Yet, REDACTED felt he was being
15 honored to be asked. REDACTED never expects anything good from
16 anyone anymore. I doubt that any man could get close enough to
17 hurt him again, or be nice to him, either. REDACTED has a shield
18 around him that is very hard to penetrate. The fact that he was
19 even able to go to the park to meet his friend is progress. Much
20 of that progress we owe to REDACTED his basketball coach last
21 year. I explained the molestation to Mr. REDACTED before the first
22 practice began. Mr. REDACTED never tried to get chummy with REDACTED
23 and never did I see him touch REDACTED or pat him on the back. But
24 he always stood there and smiled, and told REDACTED he was proud of
25 him. He straightened out the fights that REDACTED always seemed to
26 slip into without shouting or casting blame. He made REDACTED feel
27 a little more normal. He help REDACTED want to be liked, and that
28 is definitely progress, but such a drop in the bucket compared to

1 what he still lacks.

2 REDACTED has had to go through questioning after questioning.
 3 First I questioned him, then his dad did. Then the police came.
 4 Then Father O'RYAN questioned. Then the story hit the newspapers
 5 and the District Attorney questioned him. There have been
 6 pretrial hearings, visits to the court, therapists asking
 7 questions, a seemingly endless procedure. REDACTED wants to forget
 8 the molestation, but states that it is constantly with him.

9 (C) All receipts have been turned over to the probation
 10 department.

11 (D) None other than documents in the District Attorney's
 12 file.

13 Interrogatory #5

14 (A) REDACTED is still suffering mentally from the molestation.

15 (B) All receipts have been turned over the the probation
 16 department

17 (C) REDACTED present address is unknown, formerly
 18 REDACTED REDACTED

19 REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED

20 Approximately eight months to one year in 1982 REDACTED was treated
 21 by REDACTED After that, REDACTED was treated by REDACTED
 22 from May 10, 1983 for approximately one year.

23 (D) The health care providers identified in (C) above

24 (E) None other than those in the District Attorney's file.

25 (F) None other than those in the District Attorney's file.

26 Interrogatory #6

27 (A) Father ROEMER was acting to satisfy his own sexual
 28 needs and was unconcerned with the effect it would have on REDACTED

1 (B) None other than those in the District Attorney's file.

2 (C) None other than those in the District Attorney's file.

3 Interrogatory #7

4 (A) REDACTED , present address unknown, formerly of
5 REDACTED REDACTED

6 REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED

7 (B) Approximately eight months to one year in 1982 REDACTED

8 was treated by REDACTED After that, REDACTED was treated by
9 REDACTED from May 10, 1983 for approximately one year.

10 (C) This information was turned over to the Ventura County
11 Probation department and I do not have the receipts. REDACTED

12 REDACTED have evaluated REDACTED; mental state.

13 REDACTED family and teachers at Banion Elementary school in

14 Newbury Park are aware of his behavior changes. REDACTED third

15 grade teacher was REDACTED , his second grade teacher was Mrs.

16 REDACTED and Mrs. REDACTED taught REDACTED first grade.

17 (D) Report cards, any reports that the school might have.

18 District Attorney's documents.

19 (E) None

20 Interrogatory #8

21 (A) I have already outlined the personality change REDACTED
22 has suffered. He has become cynical, was afraid that he had done
23 something terrible and did not know if he could be forgiven for
24 having been the victim of Father ROEMER's molestation. REDACTED
25 thought that he was going to Hell. For many years, the incident
26 was with REDACTED everyday and he said that when he closed his eyes,
27 it was always there.

28 (B) Receipts were turned over the the probation department

1 (C) Mrs. REDACTED Mrs. REDACTED Mrs. REDACTED, REDACTED family,
2 REDACTED treating counselors.

3 Interrogatory #9

4 (A) The conduct of the ARCHDIOCESE in retaining Father
5 ROEMER after several people were informed of his pedophilia was
6 malicious. Father ROEMER's acts, performed while REDACTED was
7 sharing prayers with this priest, was more malicious.

8 (B) Father ROEMER, others unknown at this time. Discovery
9 is continuing.

10 (C) \$350,000.00 general damages, less than \$5,000.00
11 special damages

12 (D) Father ROEMER; Father REDACTED was aware of Father ROEMER's
13 pedophilia; others unknown at this time. Discovery is
14 continuing.

15 (E) None other than the documents in the District Attorney's
16 file.

17 (F) None other than the documents in the District
18 Attorney's file.

19 Interrogatory #10

20 (A) Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion. In the spirit
21 of cooperation of discovery this answer is offered:

22 Defendants had a special relationship with REDACTED and had a
23 duty to provide for his safety.

24 (B) Father ROEMER molested REDACTED as REDACTED was saying his
25 good night prayers. (Discovery is continuing at this time).

26 (C) To date, it is known that Father ROEMER breached this
27 duty of care on May 10, 1980 when he molested REDACTED REDACTED

28 (D) Father ROEMER, REDACTED family all have knowledge

1 of the molestation. Church officials knew of Father ROEMER's
2 pedophilia prior to the molestation, but at this time their names
3 are not known.

4 (E) None other than those in the District Attorney's file.

5 (F) None other than those in the District Attorney's file.

6 Interrogatory #11

7 (A) Please see answers above which deal with REDACTED mental
8 and emotional suffering. The incidents which evidence REDACTED
9 suffering are too numerous to recount.

10 (B) REDACTED data above; REDACTED, date above

11 (C) Receipts turned over to District Attorney's Office.

12 (D) Report cards, any school reports, reports of
13 counselors, District Attorney's file,

14 (E) None

15 Interrogatory #12

16 (A) Again, see above answers dealing with REDACTED emotional
17 suffering.

18 (B) As stated above, REDACTED is cynical, distrustful and
19 troubled.

20 (C) Mrs. REDACTED Mrs. REDACTED and Mrs. REDACTED the teachers
21 identified above, REDACTED family.

22 (D) School reports and report cards, documents in the
23 District Attorney's file.

24 (E) None

25 Interrogatory #13

26 (A) Anyone who observed Father ROEMER's actions with
27 children for any period of time should have been aware that he
28 was pedophile. He paid an inordinate attention to the young

1 boys, and openly stroked and petted them. The church should have
2 been aware of this.

3 (B) Father ROEMER admitted his pedophilia to Father^{REDACTED} in
4 Santa Barbara, as well as counselors, this information should
5 have been handed over to the Heirarchy. Discovery is continuing
6 at this time.

7 (C) Father^{REDACTED} he counselors whose names are unknown,
8 discovery is continuing at this time

9 (D) Unknown. Discovery is continuing at this time.

10 (E) Unknown, other than the District Attorney's file.

11 (G) Unknown.

12 Interrogatory #14

13 (A) Living with him makes it obvious. See answers above,
14 particularly 4(A) and 4(B).

15 (B) REDACTED family and teachers.

16 (C) REDACTED and Dr.^{REDACTED}, data above.

17 (D) Receipts have been turned over to the probation
18 department.

19 (E) School records, District Attorney's file

20 (F) None at this time.

21 Interrogatory #15

22 (A) Please see answer to 4(A) and 4(B) above

23 (B) \$350,000.00 general damages, less than \$5,000.00
24 special damages;

1 (C) REDACTED family, his teachers, as outlined above.

2 (D) School records, documents in the District Attorney's
3 file.

4 Dated: December 18, 1984 REDACTED

5 REDACTED

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

6461

(VERIFICATION—446, 2015.5 C. C. P.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF

I am the Plaintiff

in the above entitled action or proceeding: I have read the foregoing Plaintiff REDACTED

Responses to Interrogatories (Set One)

and know the contents thereof; and I certify that the same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated upon my information or belief, and as to those matters I believe it to be true.

I declare, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on 30 NOV. 1984 at CAMARILLO, California
(date) (place)

REDACTED

REDACTED

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL (1013a, 2015.5 C. C. P.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF

I am a resident of the county aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within entitled action; my business address is

On 12/20/84, 1984, I served the within Response to Interrogatories
(Set One); documents

on the interested parties
in said action, by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid in the

United States mail at Camarillo
addressed as follows:

BY PERSONAL SERVICE TO: 12/21/84

Patrick Roemer
REDACTED

REDACTED

6462

REDACTED

I declare, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on 12/20/84 at Camarillo, California
(date) (place)

REDACTED

REDACTED

Type or Print Name

Signature

1 Interrogatory #1

2 (A) REDACTED Santa Barbara, others unknown to me at
3 this time. Discovery is continuing.

4 (B) I know that Father ROEMER was consulting a
5 counselor/psychologist from the church in 1980. Other than that,
6 dates are unknown.

7 (C) District Attorney's file

8 (D) Father ROEMER, Father REDACTED first hand knowledge;
9 psychologist/counselor, first hand knowledge

10 (E) Documents in the District Attorney's file

11 (F) Documents in the District Attorney's file

12 Interrogatory #2

13 (A) I, REDACTED, telephoned Father REDACTED at SAINT
14 PASCHAL's parish and requested an appointment to see him. I
15 advised him over the telephone that this concerned the molesting
16 of my son by Father ROEMER. REDACTED and I went that day, December
17 27, 1980, to Father O'RYAN's office at SAINT PASHCAL's and we
18 spoke for a considerable length of time, approximately one hour.
19 I explained to Father O'RYAN the circumstances of REDACTED having
20 finally admitted what Father ROEMER had done to him, and Father
21 O'RYAN questioned REDACTED to great lengths. REDACTED was very
22 embarrassed and uncomfortable, but answered all questions put to
23 him. It was an unpleasant ordeal for him, but I felt that it was
24 necessary for Father O'RYAN to have the opportunity to talk to
25 REDACTED, since his first hand testimony was shattering and should
26 have had an effect on Father O'RYAN.

27 Two of the statements that I particularly remember Father
28 O'RYAN making at the time helped to ease my mind that the

1 situation would be remedied, and a third statement assured me
2 that my church would assume responsibility for seeing that REDACTED
3 got the help he needed so badly. The first statement was that
4 REDACTED should realize that just as there were bad people in other
5 jobs so there are bad men in the priesthood, but not many.
6 Father O'RYAN stated further the it would be like finding a
7 sliver in your finger. If you dig it out, the wound would heal,
8 but if you ignored it, it would just get worse. Father O'RYAN
9 stated that he would "take care of the problem" referring to
10 Father ROEMER.

11 When advised of the radical personality changes REDACTED had
12 undergone since the retreat, REDACTED obvious need for help was
13 discussed. Father O'RYAN stated that he would help us to obtain
14 psychological counseling. He said that there were two avenues
15 that he wanted to check out and that he would give us a call as
16 soon as possible with an answer. The two avenues which he
17 mentioned were a private therapist who was a member of the parish
18 at SAINT PASCHAL's, and the Catholic Social Services. Father
19 O'RYAN never called us back and when I finally did get in touch
20 with him, he was very brief and not nearly as open with me.
21 Father O'RYAN informed me that he would not be able to help us in
22 obtaining therapy.

23 (B) Father REDACTED and I all have first hand
24 knowledge of this notice. REDACTED , REDACTED REDACTED
25 REDACTED telephone REDACTED spoke with Father
26 O'RYAN a few months after I spoke with him, and Father O'RYAN
27 admitted that he should have done something, but that his hands
28 had been tied.

1 Interrogatory #3

2 (A) REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED
3 telephone REDACTED , was organizing the retreat weekend along
4 with Father ROEMER. She passed out the fliers to the other CCD
5 teachers, of which I was one, and collected the money for the
6 weekend. She was instrumental in the arrangement, planning,
7 operations of the event.

8 (B) The spring of 1980

9 (C) REDACTED REDACTED
10 REDACTED telephone REDACTED was a member of the parish at
11 SAINT PASCHAL's, and took care of my younger son during the
12 retreat weekend. She was aware of the flier, and knew of the
13 people organizing the retreat. She was also a CCD teacher there
14 at the same time.

15 (D) The flier mentioned in 2(A), and a follow-up letter
16 giving those on the retreat the names and addresses of other
17 participants are the only two documents put out by the church of
18 which I am aware. I have been unable to obtain copies of either
19 documents, but it is possible that they are still held within the
20 files of SAINT PASCHAL's. It is also possible that Mrs. REDACTED
21 REDACTED named in 2(A) above, would have a copy.

22 (E) Unknown

23 Interrogatory #4

24 (A) My inability to continue my close relationship with my
25 church is verifiable through my friends as well as church
26 donation records. Witnessing my son completely change from a
27 sweet young child to a cynical, and untrusting child has been
28 devastating. I have lost many friendships, and my daily

1 activities have been necessarily rescheduled around therapy
2 appointments and meeting REDACTED emotional needs.

3 (B) The first sign of my emotional distress has been in
4 dealing with REDACTED His radical personality change seemed likely
5 to drive the family apart before we finally admitted what
6 happened. I still continue, at times, to feel unreasonable guilt
7 over whether or not there was something that I could have done
8 that might have prevented the tragedy. All the old "Don't talk
9 to strangers" speeches seem so futile now. REDACTED is not the same
10 person he was before the molestation. He has never again been
11 carefree or young. His cynical attitude alienates those who love
12 him. His self-destructive behavior has diminished, as has most
13 of his physical lashing out at others, but this is control, not
14 relief. REDACTED cries easily and inappropriately. He shows a mean
15 streak towards other boys, and has a barrier between himself and
16 those men with whom he must deal. In some ways he is no longer a
17 child. In other ways, he is far too much a child for someone now
18 in the sixth grade. I deal with this daily. Somedays I think
19 that he might be starting to do better. A teacher will tell me
20 that he seems to be relating better with his peers; and then a
21 parent will call me and complain about a needless, unkindness or
22 fight, and I know that it is not over yet.

23 Another area of extreme distress is in the change in
24 attitude between REDACTED and his father. It is almost as though
25 they have no relationship at all. REDACTED no longer tries to
26 please his father. His father reacts with anger and impatience.
27 They never touch. They rarely speak to one another, unless in
28 anger. REDACTED father has been rejected by REDACTED, and his father

1 hurt is manifested in an attitude that tells REDACTED that he will
2 not ever again try to break through the wall REDACTED has built up
3 around himself. It is easy for a mother to see when one of three
4 sons gets the brunt of the punishments, the sharpest lash of
5 temper. REDACTED father really tried at first to get close to
6 REDACTED again after we found out the molestation. REDACTED could not
7 handle the closeness, and now REDACTED father has stopped trying.
8 This has been a major factor in the deterioration of the
9 relationship. We are all still together, but the fun is gone.

10 REDACTED attitude even affects his brothers. They are each
11 about four years apart, being three, seven and almost eleven.
12 The two young ones get along very well. I can take REDACTED alone
13 anywhere, or the two young ones together anywhere, and all is
14 well. Put REDACTED in the group with his brothers, and the fights
15 start. He teases. He punches. He keeps then at a distance, and
16 alienates them; then he cries because they don't like them. I
17 deal with this daily. As it is impossible to know how to deal
18 with the situation. My health is not good anymore. Life is not
19 fun at our house anymore. I can't reach him.

20 I have lost my feelings of spiritual security within my
21 church. We changed parishes. Even at SAINT JULIE's, it is an
22 effort to make myself go. I no longer sing with the church
23 choir. I don't teach CCD classes. When I go to mass, it is no
24 longer for myself. I go because the children should be there. I
25 don't feel that I am part of that community anymore. The priest
26 did not do that. The priest was a person, and all of us do
27 wrong, although his crime was more than just wrong. It is still
28 inconceivable to me. And yet, I felt that the church could have

1 helped us. They could have, and decided not to do so. A letter
2 that I wrote to Cardinal Manning literally took the heart out of
3 me, trying to explain what had happened and what was happening.
4 I asked for help and support. We were expecting our third son at
5 the time, and I stated that REDACTED needed help and we were
6 financially unable to provide. I received back a formal note
7 from one of the Cardinal's staff offering prayers for our family
8 and \$500.00 for partial help in paying the expenses of the birth
9 of our new child. It was a crushing blow. I tried to write
10 another letter, but I just could not do it. I wanted to send the
11 check back and tell them to keep it, but at that point it would
12 have meant food from the table, so we used the money. REDACTED will
13 never be the same. As my opinion of the Catholic church changed,
14 and as it became more difficult and less productive to force
15 REDACTED to attend mass, my husband stopped going. He never goes
16 anymore. He no longer talks of converting. He sees the church
17 too clearly as a business entity.

18 Our middle son is to make his first communion this year.
19 After his CCD teacher scolded me for not taking him to mass, I
20 have now gone three weeks in a row. The teacher said she could
21 not do anything for him if we did not take him to church. I am
22 trying to force myself to go each Sunday. It is a pressure that
23 I would rather not feel, but maybe I can gain back some of what I
24 have lost.

25 There is one other area of daily distress, and I do not
26 expect it ever to lessen while I have young boys in my care. It
27 is not possible to be constantly with them. It is not possible
28 to really protect them. They must be allowed to play outside, to

1 attend school, to join sports. I cannot follow them everywhere;
 2 I cannot really protect them. When they go out that door in the
 3 morning will they make it back safely? I am fearful of teachers,
 4 coaches, scout leaders, a friend's husband-someone a child would
 5 trust-one of these hurt my sons, I wish I knew what the future
 6 holds. I wish I could forget.

7 (C) I have not sought counseling. General damages
 8 \$50,000.00

9 (D) None

10 (E) None

11 Interrogatory #5

12 (A) The obligation was breached by Father ROEMER's
 13 molestation.

14 (B) REDACTED and our family, Father ROEMER.

15 (C) None other than the District Attorney's file.

16 (D) None other than the District Attorney's file.

17 Interrogatory #6

18 (A) I have incurred expenses in connection with providing
 19 for REDACTED care; REDACTED , present address unknown,
 20 formerly of the REDACTED

REDACTED

21 REDACTED REDACTED telephone

22 REDACTED

23 (B) Receipts have been turned over to the probation
 24 department

25 (C) REDACTED family, his teachers at Banion Elementary
 26 School.

27 (D) The letter I wrote to Cardinal Manning.

28 (E) None other than those in the District Attorney's file.

1 Interrogatory #7

2 (A) I paid for the retreat which we attended as per plans.

3 (B) REDACTED address above, REDACTED address

4 above, have knowledge of the retreat

5 (C) The fliers which SAINT PASCHAL's provided.

6 Dated: 12.20.84 REDACTED

7
8 REDACTED

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

(VERIFICATION—446, 2015.5 C.C.P.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF

I am the Plaintiff

in the above entitled action or proceeding: I have read the foregoing Plaintiff REDACTED

REDACTED Responses to Interrogatories (Set One)

and know the contents thereof; and I certify that the same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated upon my information or belief, and as to those matters I believe it to be true.

I declare, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on 30 NOV. 1984 at CAMARILLO, California
(date) (place)

REDACTED

KATHLEEN HARRELL

Type or Print Name

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL (1013a, 2015.5 C.C.P.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF

I am, a resident of the county aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within entitled action. My business address is

REDACTED

On 12/20/84, 1984, I served the within documents

on the interested parties
in said action, by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Camarillo, CA 93010
addressed as follows:

Patrick Roemer
REDACTED

BY PERSONAL DELIVERY: (12/21/84)

REDACTED

REDACTED

6447

REDACTED

I declare, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on 12/20/84 at Camarillo, California
(date) (place)

REDACTED

REDACTED

NAME AND ADDRESS OF ATTORNEY DEFENDANT WITH ATTORNEY Mr. Patrick Roemer REDACTED		TELEPHONE (818) 888-1732	FOR COURT USE ONLY
ATTORNEY FOR In Pro Per		MAR 26 1985	RECEIVED FILED MAR 25 1985 RICHARD D. DEAN, County Clerk By _____ Deputy County Clerk
NAME OF COURT, BRANCH, JUDICIAL DISTRICT, TOWN AND OTHER ADDRESS SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF VENTURA 800 S. Victoria Avenue, Ventura, California 93009			
PLAINTIFF REDACTED			
DEFENDANT The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles, et al			
GENERAL DENIAL		CASE NUMBER 82750	

THIS GENERAL DENIAL MAY BE USED ONLY WHERE THE COMPLAINT IS UNVERIFIED OR WHERE THE COMPLAINT IS VERIFIED BUT THE DEMAND OR VALUE OF THE PROPERTY IN CONTROVERSY DOES NOT EXCEED \$1,000

- 1. Defendant (Name): Patrick Roemer
generally denies each and every allegation of plaintiff's ~~xxxxxxx~~ First Amended Complaint
- 2. Defendant asserts the following affirmative defenses (Set forth briefly the facts constituting each separate affirmative defense [See item 3a]. Attach additional pages if necessary.):

6818

Dated March 25, 1985

Patrick Roemer
Signature of defendant
PATRICK ROEMER

NOTICES TO DEFENDANT

- 3a. An affirmative defense is new matter constituting a defense to plaintiff's claim which must be stated in defendant's response. New matter is generally some fact or facts which would prevent the plaintiff from obtaining a judgment against you even if all of plaintiff's factual claims were proven to be true. Affirmative defenses recognized by law are of many kinds, such as self-defense, privilege, lack of capacity to sue, statute of limitations, and discharge of the debt by payment.
- b. If you have a claim for damages or other relief against the plaintiff, the law may require that your claim be set forth in a separate pleading called a cross-complaint or your claim may be forever barred. (See Code of Civil Procedure Sections 426.10-426.40.)

3/27/85 Send copy to Judge Hawker, then to 'pledge' file

(VERIFICATION - 441 and 2015.5 C.C.P.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF _____

I, the undersigned, declare: I am the _____

in the above-entitled action; I have read the foregoing _____

and know the contents thereof; and the same is true of my own knowledge, except as to the matters which are there-
stated upon my information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date

Signature of Declarant

Type or Print Full Name of Declarant and Title, if applicable

(PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL - 1013a, 2015.5 C.C.P.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF VENTURAI am a resident of/employed in the aforesaid county, State of California; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a
party to the within action; my business address/residence address is: 1986 S. Victoria
Avenue, Ventura, CaliforniaOn March 25, 1985, I served the foregoing GENERAL DENIALOF DEFENDANT PATRICK ROEMER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

(set forth the exact title of the document served)

on the interested partiesin this action by placing a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United
States mail at Ventura, California, addressed as follows:Ms. REDACTED
REDACTED

REDACTED

I certify (or declare), under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct.

March 25, 1985

Date

Patrick Roemer

Signature of Declarant

PATRICK ROEMER

Type or Print Full Name of Declarant

REDACTED

Sunday, 9-29-85.

Dear Archbishop Mahony,

I hope and pray that all goes well for you, and all your work there! May I please add my "congratulations" to you as our new Archbishop!

I've decided to write you - to say both "hello", and to share a little more personally of myself because I can see some real changes in my life that I'd like to inform you about, and also to ask your "opinion-advice".

I was ordained a priest in 1970, spent 11½ yrs. actively up in Santa Barbara, and until 1981, in Thousand Oaks. I was accused for child molesting at St Paschal's

6636

and after 6 months of my personal
and different court hearings, I was
sentenced to 10 years at a maximum
state hospital. In 1983, after 22
mos. there, I was sentenced to 10
years probation (8 years suspended
prior sentence). I just recently com-
pleted 2 1/2 years probation, and am
doing well. I am on "inactive
leave" status, and believe that I
want to continue in that position
for some time. I grew quite a
bit in that period of being
"locked away," and still feel a
need for more personal growth.
I attend 2 1/2 hours of group & private
therapy a week, and also see a
priest privately at Mojave for spiritual
direction. My present job is as a
bookstore manager at SCLC in Redon-
do Beach. The last 2 years I have

6637

tried extensively to seek other ³
 employment on the "solar" jobs,
 help those of assisting others, &
 have been unsuccessful. I believe
 that my gifts & talents are best
 used in assisting others while
 making sure I do not lose myself
 in the process. I recently applied
 to the "psychiatric technician" training
 program at Alascadero (where I was
 a patient), and took the written
 test last Monday. If I pass, I
 face a different oral interview, and
 if I pass there, I could be chosen
 to begin a 1 year's intensive study
 experience program there to be learned.
 If I am accepted, I'll need to
 try and get my probation changed
 to San Luis Obispo County, and many
 other details taken care of.

Thanks, as far, for your patience in
 reading thru all of this. I am

24

asking you if I may please
 Come to see you, and find out
 what are the "parameters" of
 my being "on leave" in our
 subdiocese - may I return to
 the active priesthood here at
 some time in the future, or
later? I have not personally
 shot the dove to this, but I
 also need to know your true
 feelings about this. I would
 appreciate being able to sit
 down & discuss some of these
 things with you.

Have a great week!

I wish for you all the best -

Be at peace -

sincerely & gratefully,

D. R. Roemer

REDACTED

6639

Pat. Roemer

REDACTED

ALBANY



Most. Rev. Roger Mahony,
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, Ca. 90015

Personal

6640

October 7, 1985

Pat Roemer
REDACTED

Dear Pat:

I wish to acknowledge your letter of September 29th 1985, and although I do not know you personally I have heard of your case.

It is my understanding that you are on "inactive leave" status and that is the status which I also wish to continue.

I was glad to have the information about your past situation and your present and future plans. I share your hope that you may be able to enter into some type of counseling work for the future.

It is not appropriate at this time to discuss the possibility of any future priestly ministry since you are still on legal probation, and I understand there are civil suits pending as well. Possibly once all of those matters are settled, some years from now, it may be opportune to look into some of the broader questions which still remain.

Assuring you of my prayers and with every best wish I am

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Most Reverend Roger Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles

REDACTED

October 7, 1985

Pat Roemer
REDACTED

Dear Pat:

I wish to acknowledge your letter of September 29th 1985, and although I do not know you personally I have heard of your case.

It is my understanding that you are on "inactive leave" status and that is the status which I also wish to continue.

I was glad to have the information about your past situation and your present and future plans. I share your hope that you may be able to enter into some type of counseling work for the future.

It is not appropriate at this time to discuss the possibility of any future priestly ministry since you are still on legal probation, and I understand there are civil suits pending as well. Possibly once all of those matters are settled, some years from now, it may be opportune to look into some of the broader questions which still remain.

Assuring you of my prayers and with every best wish I am

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Most Reverend Roger Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles

REDACTED

REDACTED

Oct. 25, 1985.

Dear Archbishop Mahony,

I hope and pray that all goes well for you!

I thank you for your letter of October 7th.

I still would like to ask if I could come to talk with you. I appreciate that your schedule is a very busy one, but is it possible for me to personally speak with you sometime soon?

Have a good week.

Sincerely and Gratefully,
Pat Roemer

REDACTED

Home ph.
work " (x

6634

November 6, 1985

Pat Roemer
REDACTED

Dear Pat:

As the Archbishop mentioned to you in his letter of October 7th a meeting with you at this time would not be appropriate.

Once matters involving your probation and other civil suits have been settled then we can look at your situation.

Thank you for your understanding.

Sincerely,

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

May 6, 1986

REDACTED

RECEIVED

MAY 9 1986

REDACTED

Attorneys At Law
 1545 Wilshire Boulevard
 Suite 800
 Los Angeles, CA 90017

Re: REDACTED vs. Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles,
 et. al.

Dear REDACTED

I did not provide you with the letter from Father Roemer to Judge
 REDACTED dated March 25, 1981 because I do not have an original of
 that letter. I do, however, have a transcription of that letter
 which I am enclosing. I would imagine that the original letter
 is in the Court's files.

As you can see, in the letter he admits confiding in a member of
 the Catholic clergy about his sexual attractions to young boys
 while he was in Santa Barbara. Of course, this would have
 occurred previous to the time the children were molested.

I have received extensive psychological evaluations on all of the
 children and am in the process of putting together a structured
 settlement demand for the children and a lump sum offer for REDACTED
 REDACTED

You should expect to receive that package by the end of June.

Please call should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED
 REDACTED
 Enclosure

6804

REDACTED

REDACTED

5/9/86 cc

+ Donna Patrick Roemer.

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

*9/15/86
No Action
Required
Dover*

REDACTED
REDACTED

Re: REDACTED v. RCA, et al.
Ventura County Superior Court Case No. 82750

Dear REDACTED

I am taking the liberty of replying to your letter of May 6, 1986 addressed to REDACTED

The facsimile copy of the Roemer letter (3/25/81) which was attached to your letter raises two very substantial and significant issues. (I am referring to the second paragraph wherein he says that he described his "problem" to a "priest-confidante" in Santa Barbara.)

The first question raised is that of what is sometimes referred to as the "seal of the confessional." The priest hearing a penitent's confession cannot act on what he hears in the confessional outside the confessional under Canon Law. Thus there can be no civil vicarious liability on the part of the RCA if the person is a priest such as in this case.

The second question raised is the clergyman-penitent privilege in Evidence Code sections 1030-1034. Section 1034 seems to comport with Canon Law. The priest referred to in the Roemer letter definitely feels that he is bound by the seal of the confessional and section 1034 under the circumstances of this case.

I thought it only fair to bring this to your attention. Our client is interested in trying to work out something for the youngsters involved; and therefore, we look forward to the

6802

REDACTED

May 13, 1986

Page 2

settlement package mentioned in your letter of May 6, 1986.

Very truly yours,

REDACTED[^]

bcc: REDACTED

6803

St. Paschal Baylon Church

155 East Janss Road

Thousand Oaks, California 91360

REDACTED

June 6, 1986

Rev. Msgr. John A. Rawden
1531 W. Ninth Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

Dear Archie,

I'm writing to ask if you can obtain any information for me concerning civil suits against Pat Roemer in the Archdiocese. I hear from time to time stories that such suits or suit is in process, but I really don't know anything about it. It would be helpful if I could have some information. For instance, I don't even know who the litigants are. It would be helpful to know their names. It would also be helpful to know something about what stage the suit is in and how long lawyers anticipate it will take to be settled. If there is anything you can give me on this Archie I would appreciate it or if there is someone that you can refer me to I would appreciate that too.

Thank you very much for your kindness in the past and now.

Faternally yours,

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED



THE ARCHDIOCESE OF SAN FRANCISCO
PASTORAL CENTER

THE TRIBUNAL

445 CHURCH STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94114-1799 (415) 565-3690

June 30, 1989

Most Reverend Roger Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015-1194

Dear Archbishop Mahony,

I am in receipt of your letter of June 21, 1989; and I wish to acknowledge your favorable decision with regard to our request that the Archdiocese of Los Angeles compensate Reverend Patrick Roemer in the amount of \$1,500 per month.

Father Roemer has asked me to indicate to you his gratitude for your considerations in this matter; and he has also asked that I inform you formally that he accepts the decisions that you have made in the matter of his support as indicated in your letters of May 17, 1989, and June 21, 1989.

Father Roemer has been in contact with Monsignor Curry, and it is my understanding that appointments are being scheduled in order to establish a process by which he can begin to seek employment. He definitely shares your hope that he will be able to establish himself before the end of the six-month period.

In closing, may I express my personal gratitude for the spirit of pastoral concern that has been demonstrated in bringing this delicate and sensitive matter to a conclusion. It has been a lengthy process, but one which I believe has given careful consideration to Father Roemer's situation.

REDACTED

cc: Reverend D. Patrick Roemer

6872

REDACTED

REDACTED

August 26, 1986

REDACTED

RECEIVED

AUG 28 1986

REDACTED

Re: REDACTED vs. Archdiocese, et. al.

Dear Mr. REDACTED :

The following is a settlement proposal in connection with the above-referenced matter. I have included for your evaluation psychological studies done on each of the four molested boys. The studies were performed by Dr. REDACTED who has an excellent reputation here in Ventura County.

I am sure that you are well aware of the national nature of the problem of priest pedophiles and of the attention focused on this problem by the media. I have been in contact with various attorneys who are handling these cases. I am including a tape of a West 57th Street report on the issue which is followed by the Dan Rather CBS News broadcast which highlighted the problem, focusing on the Louisiana cases which have been studied in the National Catholic Reporter. It should be noted that Louisiana law does not provide for punitive damages. I have previously provided you with the Time magazine article which mentioned our case in its overview of the national dilemma of Catholic priests who are child molesters.

The primary losses of all these victims are essentially threefold:

1. The loss of religion, faith, spirituality;
2. The loss of innocence;
3. The loss of trust;

The children's experience of having been the sexual object of a Catholic priest has had a devastating and rippling effect on their young lives. To young people, a priest is God; the children's feelings toward Father Roemer were particularly imbued with this attitude. Father Roemer was in charge of children's services at St. Paschal's and was regarded with deep reverence

6781

REDACTED

and affection. He had received numerous accolades from community groups, honoring him for his services to children. Indeed, when the molestations of the plaintiffs were first made public, the community responded with almost unerring backing of Father Roemer and accusations that the children were lying. The children were aware of the community response, and this made the experience all the more devastating for them.

The children's response was, predictably, in many ways, uniform. To be singled out by the clergy for positive purposes leads to feelings of specialness and unique worth. To be singled out the clergy for abuse carries with it the same impact, but to its reverse. Other than unique feelings of self-worth, a child feels equally intense feelings of self-loathing and self-denigration. All the children in this case suffered the different types of psychological damage flowing from being victims of sexual abuse.

[The tragedy in all these cases is that many of these molestations could have been prevented. Plaintiff REDACTED who was 12 at the time he was molested by Father Roemer, had on enumerable occasions shared with his parents his fears of Father Roemer. Those fears were based on his observations from ages 10 through 12 of Father Roemer's conduct with young boys. Young REDACTED observed Father Roemer at football games and sports camp activities acting overly affectionate with young boys. He told his parents that the priest was constantly touching, hugging, and rubbing the faces, heads and bodies of other children and advised his mother that he thought the conduct by the priest was inappropriate. These observations by a young child certainly could and should have been made by persons working with Father Roemer.]

[During the course of Father Roemer's evaluation by the criminal courts, he acknowledged sexual involvement with over 20 children dating back to 1970 after his graduation from St. John's Seminary in Camarillo.] Father Roemer has admitted that his molestation of the children was carried out to gratify his own sexual needs and that erection and ejaculation normally accompanied his activities of fondling children. [He had confided with "Father REDACTED at the Santa Barbara parish about his problem, and Father Roemer sought assistance through a psychologist while assigned to Santa Barbara parishes.] [While these communications are privileged under California law, certainly they fly in the face of Canon 2359 paragraph 3;

"Any touching with the intent of physical arousal is cause for suspension and the priest must be stripped of his duties."

[The May 1980 molestation of Plaintiff REDACTED was shared with Father Colm O'Ryan in December of 1980. Father

O'Ryan met with Plaintiffs REDACTED and REDACTED at St. Paschal's. In that meeting after REDACTED literally bared his soul and shared with Father O'Ryan the terrifying experience he had kept from everyone for seven months. Father O'Ryan, who was Monsignor at St. Paschal's, along with Father REDACTED and who had placed Father Roemer in charge of children services at that parish, assured Mrs. REDACTED that he would investigate the matter and would talk to Father Roemer. Father Roemer remained in his position until he was arrested.]

After their one hour meeting, Father O'Ryan assured Mrs. REDACTED that he would "take care of it" and said he would talk to a parishioner about psychological help for REDACTED and would contact Catholic Social Services on REDACTED behalf. This was never done.

Father Roemer was not removed from his position. Father O'Ryan later told both REDACTED and others that "his hands had been tied" and that he could do nothing about Father Roemer even after notification by the REDACTED of Father Roemer's molestation of REDACTED. The REDACTED did not pursue criminal charges based on Father O'Ryan's representations that the matter would be handled within the Church.

The REDACTED went to New Year's Day Mass, January 1981, at St. Paschal's and were shocked to see that not only had Father Roemer not been removed from his position, but he was conducting the mass. This frightened REDACTED greatly. Mrs. REDACTED called Father O'Ryan the next day (Monday, January 2, 1981) and was told he was busy and could not talk. She called on Tuesday and was given the same story. She then went down to St. Paschal's and at that point Father O'Ryan told her that "his hands were tied" that the parishioner he had formerly mentioned could not help with psychological care, and that Catholic Social Services could not get into the middle of the matter. He told Mrs. REDACTED that if REDACTED needed therapy, that would be her responsibility.


Father REDACTED at Sacred Heart Church in Saticoy was contacted by Lt. REDACTED of the Ventura County Sheriff's Office on December 30, 1980 concerning an investigation of Father Roemer in connection with REDACTED revelations. Again, nothing was done by any member of the Catholic clergy and of course, in late January, 1981, Father Roemer continued his course of conduct and this time chose Plaintiffs REDACTED and REDACTED as his next victims. The Church had retained Father Roemer in his position. The REDACTED molestations were performed during REDACTED confession and prior to REDACTED CCD classes at the parish.

Father O'Ryan was approached by Mr. REDACTED in February of 1981, who was an officer of SLAM, a group sponsoring a Stronger Legislation Against Molesters. [Father O'Ryan told Mr.

REDACTED "I blew it."] I did not do the right thing." Father O'Ryan had been Father Roemer's superior for two and one half years. Father O'Ryan was referring to his retention of Father Roemer in his position as head of children's services at St. Paschal's and the fact that he did indeed go on to molest Plaintiffs REDACTED and REDACTED even after the revelation of the sexual molestation of REDACTED

The following is a proposal for each plaintiff:

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED was six years old when he was molested by Father Roemer, whom he had affectionately called "Father Pat".

He described to Ventura County Sheriff's officers the incident as follows:

A while ago, my family and I went camping with a church group. The first night we were there, I asked Father Pat to come over to my bed and say my good night prayers. After saying the prayers, Father Pat reached down my underwear and began feeling my penis. He did it for about the time it takes to count to 20. During that time Father Pat talked about "Peace", I did not do or say anything at the time.

REDACTED father was sleeping in a bunk a short distance away and was sound asleep at the time. REDACTED was wearing underwear and no pajamas and was under the covers. REDACTED said he felt like screaming to his Dad but did not have the courage. REDACTED did not know what to do. He did not mention the molestation to anyone, but stated he relived it every time he closed his eyes.

REDACTED personality change began right after the incident. He did not share the experience with anyone because he thought he might get in trouble. He refused to go to church. REDACTED is a gifted child and his school performance declined noticeably for one year after the molestation. Prior to the molestation, he was viewed as an easy going, adaptable child with minimal conflict with his parents. He became a very serious behavior problem during the seven months after the molestation before REDACTED revealed it.

REDACTED became consumed with self-loathing. He began to throw temper tantrums, cut on his headboard with a pocket knife, played with a cigarette lighter in his bed and burn the blankets, pillows and a jacket and was constantly getting in trouble. He refused to sit on his father's lap and had tremendous difficulties relating to his father. He felt that he was a bad person. His outlook on life became pessimistic as though others did not care for him. Although this outlook has lessened, he has never retained his original carefree attitude toward life. He is wary of adults, especially male authority figures.

REDACTED is described as having a continuing deficit in his social adjustment. He has become socially reserved and is not trustful. He is cautious and conservative to the effect that his attitudes have had a significant impact on his interpersonal functioning. He fears the dark, has somatic complaints, fears social events and worries about his parents and other family members not being available to him. He is more distrustful than others his age and keeps his distance from people, maintaining an attitude of objectivity and skepticism. He is cautious toward other children, careful and watchful. There are times when he

has overwhelming doubts, fears and a sense of hopelessness about his future even though he knows he is very capable mentally.

Death is considered as an alternative to REDACTED. Following the molestation, REDACTED showed an abnormally high degree of unacceptable social behavior and these problems continue. He has an excessive interest in sex and masturbation which has occurred frequently and has not been conducted in the privacy which one would expect. At the same time, he has exaggerated modesty.

REDACTED is very sensitive to the possibility of rejection. He does not have good tolerance for frustration when it bears on his sense of self-worth. In group situations, he is very sensitive to rejection and is sensitive to demands made on him by others. He is quick to react with noncompliance and irritability and is demanding and argumentative. He feels that he is not accepted by his peers and is quite afraid that others will find out about his victimization.

REDACTED religious and spiritual adjustment have been completely and totally undermined. To REDACTED Father Roemer was more than a spiritual advisor; he was a friend and an alternate father symbol for the one who had abandoned him as an infant (Mr. REDACTED is REDACTED; step-father).

REDACTED used to look forward to going to church and now is cynical about religion. To REDACTED, Father Roemer and God were so closely intertwined that he cannot understand why a God would be so cruel.

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

One of the tragedies in REDACTED case is the fact that had this incident not occurred, REDACTED might well have chosen the priesthood as his vocation. He is a very introspective child, is bright, and tries to emphasize conscientiousness, persistence and

adherence to moral standards in his thoughts and actions. He considers himself morally disciplined, ordered and dominated by a sense of duty. Caring for others is an essential theme in his conception of what he should strive to be. REDACTED rejects religion. REDACTED felt that priests were sent from God and working for God. If one of God's people did something wrong, maybe God was responsible. REDACTED is still reticent to go to mass and has lost that spiritual link with his family that he had enjoyed previous to the molestation.

It is requested that a \$250,000.00 settlement be put into a structure that would pay out at REDACTED 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st, and 22nd birthdays as well as his 25th and 30th birthdays. Initial payments would cover attorney's fees and costs.

REDACTED

REDACTED was ten years old at the time of his molestation. The incident occurred in late January 1981 after a CCD (religious instruction) class. REDACTED was taken to Father Roemer in order to give his confession. Father Roemer instructed him to sit on his lap in the confessional. Father Roemer fondled REDACTED's chest when

he asked him the confessional question, "What had REDACTED done wrong?" Father Roemer rubbed REDACTED stomach, chest and underarm area touching his skin under his shirt. Father Roemer kissed him on the right ear twice while he was massaging his body.

Prior to that incident, REDACTED loved going to church, enjoyed his religious education classes and family participation in church activities. When REDACTED was asked what his thoughts were on whether his own sexuality would be affected by what happened to him, he stated "There is a chance. I am not saying it is going to happen or it won't. Sometimes I think about it. Every time I think about being gay, it makes me sick."

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

Added to these problems is the loss REDACTED has had in his spiritual life. Like the other children, he is now skeptical and cynical about religion. The entire REDACTED family used to be a close Catholic unit which shared religious and spiritual feelings; they also shared participation in church related social activities and the inclusion of Catholic life philosophies in their lives. The REDACTED no longer believe in any Catholic religious or spiritual philosophies. The Sunday mornings which they used to share together are not spent in joint activities. [The REDACTED once tried the Mormon church as an alternative, but found this to be unsatisfactory.]

REDACTED

REDACTED

A \$250,000.00 settlement is proposed, to be put into a structure that would pay out at REDACTED 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st, and 22nd birthdays as well as his 25th and 30th birthdays. Initial payments would cover attorney's fees and costs.

REDACTED

REDACTED was seven years old when he was molested. On January 26, 1981, REDACTED was at St. Paschal's for the purpose of attending CCD classes. Father Roemer asked REDACTED to come into his office to look at some old yearbook pictures. REDACTED went into the office and Father Roemer sat in a chair near a desk. Father Roemer lifted REDACTED up and placed him on his leg, far enough back so that REDACTED was close to Father Roemer's chest.

Father Roemer showed REDACTED a book with pictures from when Father Roemer had gone to school. REDACTED said it was the kind of book where everyone in the class takes pictures together. While looking at the book, Father Roemer put his hand under REDACTED T-shirt and started to rub REDACTED stomach in slow circular movements. Father Roemer kissed REDACTED on the neck near the right ear as he was rubbing him. Father Roemer then slid his hands down into REDACTED pants and inside his underpants. He massaged REDACTED penis with short fast strokes. REDACTED stated that Father Roemer's hands and legs were shaking at the time and he asked Father Roemer why he was shaking all over. Father Roemer replied, "I am cold." REDACTED stated that it was hot in the room at the time and Father Roemer was wearing a jacket. REDACTED became scared and asked Father Roemer if he could leave.

Father Roemer has stated that he did have an erection and ejaculated during the time that he was fondling REDACTED. REDACTED reported the incident to his parents at dinner that night and the police were contacted. Father Roemer's arrest followed. REDACTED felt guilty about telling on the priest. He did not stop Father Roemer, even though he knows the priest was doing something terribly wrong, because he was afraid. He still fears that Father Roemer might come back and molest him or hurt him. Further, REDACTED has had to cope with the inappropriate aggressiveness and hostility of his older brother REDACTED which was resulted from REDACTED molestation.

REDACTED does not think he will ever go to church again. He is angry with himself that he did not do anything to try to stop Father Roemer or hit Father Roemer. He has rapid mood changes in which he get frustrated, and becomes very aggressive. [The fact that REDACTED was the first to reveal Father Roemer's sexual advances made him the focus of attention of law enforcement and the news media and this was a hardship on REDACTED as well as the rest of his family.] His parents feel he is excessively embarrassed about being identified as a victim. He has become hysterical over the prospect of such identification. He consulted Dr. REDACTED a psychologist, due to the trauma of his victimization.

REDACTED has expressed concern that the molestation experience could make him gay and still worries about the possibility. His school performance declined greatly after the molestation and was marked by a decline in interest as well as effort.

His parents feel his embarrassment and sensitivity over his victimization have made him more withdrawn and prone to overreact to criticism and avoid situations in which he might fail. He is concerned about "informing" on a priest and has strong guilt feelings.

REDACTED has stated, "I grew up all through the Church and I feel we miss it." Like REDACTED, he lacks any spiritual faith and recognizes the void in his spiritual and family life which was once filled by the Catholic Church. [Dr. REDACTED predicts "a sleeper effect" caused by REDACTED sexual abuse;] his statements would indicate he experiences an ongoing sense of humiliation of being used as a sexual object and dismay at the discovery of his impotency when it came to protecting himself from such inappropriate advances. He believes he was victimized because he was a weak person. His current psychological make-up is one which shields him from reality and has prevented him from developing mechanisms of coping with stress.

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

In the summer of 1980, REDACTED was attending a sports camp held at St. Pascal's school. REDACTED was 12 at the time. [Prior to the time he was molested by Father Roemer, he had observed the priest for approximately two years being what REDACTED considered to be overly affectionate with young boys.] These observations were at football games and at the sports camp. REDACTED saw that the priest was constantly touching, hugging and rubbing the faces, heads and upper bodies of other children and advised his mother that he thought this conduct by the priest was inappropriate. His mother assured him that she would be there most of the time and would be able to protect him.

On the first day of sports camp, Father Roemer came up close behind REDACTED and wrapped his arms around REDACTED chest, resting his chin on REDACTED head. This made REDACTED extremely nervous and uncomfortable and for the rest of the day, he tried to avoid the priest. When his mother picked him up that afternoon, he told her that he did not want to return to the camp and explained what Father Roemer had done. His mother told him to avoid the priest and that she would come to the field early to pick him up every day and watch him. The next day, REDACTED felt like the priest was looking for him all day. At one point, while REDACTED was playing soccer, Father Roemer approached him and said, cynically, "You can't get away from me." The next day while REDACTED was playing football Father Roemer complimented REDACTED on his running ability and said that he was a good runner when he was in school. He asked REDACTED to come to his office and look at sports pictures in his yearbook. REDACTED felt that Father Roemer was a homosexual and that his behavior was typical of that of a homosexual.]

That afternoon, when the activities were over for the day, REDACTED went to the front of the church and waited for his ride. He was sitting on a bench when Father Roemer came up and sat very close to him, touching his body and putting his arm around him. He kept his arm around REDACTED until some other boys came up and started talking to him.

In October of 1980, REDACTED was signing up for flag football at Thousand Oaks High School and saw Father Roemer there. He hid from him, not wanting Father Roemer to see him because he was afraid of him. Three months later REDACTED saw Father Roemer at Westlake Theatre with a single young boy.

[REDACTED states that he could tell that Father Roemer was deriving sexual pleasure out of the touching of him and other young boys; he knew that Father Roemer was not normal.]

These incidents made REDACTED extremely afraid of Father Roemer, fearful that he might try to come to his home to get him. He did not want his mother to leave home and until the ninth grade exhibited strong fears related to Father Roemer. He began to have nightmares. When Father Roemer was arrested and convicted,

REDACTED was scared that he would break out of jail and get him, even though he was assured by his parents that this would not happen. REDACTED experience affected his relationship with his father.

REDACTED was on guard and felt that he could not trust adult males. His deep fear of being left alone affected the entire family. As he did not want his mother to leave during the day, she had to cut back on her work hours in order to accommodate him. His frequent bad dreams were accompanied by a lack of self-confidence, excessive dependence on his parents, and immature reactions. During the months after the molestation, he was tense, sensitive and prone to being preoccupied with his own needs. He lost his temper often and was not willing to go along with family plans. REDACTED felt guilty, was afraid of sleeping alone and talked excessively about dying or being injured. His parents report that these changes had subsided by the summer of 1985. His parents feel he was affected so strongly by Father Roemer's advances because Father Roemer was so persistent in attempting to gain physical contact with REDACTED

REDACTED still feels he could not be in the same room with a man alone, like a teacher. He is still on guard and his preoccupation hinders him in athletic endeavors. Physical contact in school sports bothered him and he is afraid of what others will think of him.

REDACTED view of the Catholic Church and religion has changed. [Although he was not a Catholic prior to the incident, he was quite religious.] He felt God spoke through priests and nuns and now believes that they do not and should not have the trust of people and that they are "more screwed up" than normal people. He is very bitter toward the Catholic Church.

His total disillusionment with religious persons began with his discovery that a priest approached him with sexual intentions. He believed religious persons were committing a fraud on an unwilling subject and his experience as being a victim of a sexual assault by a priest has put a considerable distance between REDACTED and the possibility of the beneficial effects of associating with religion. He suffers from a low level of continuing anger growing out of his perception that he is a socially defensive person as a result of being the object of this sexual approach. He feels that he has a sense of distance from male persons and the experience has deprived him of time and opportunities he would otherwise realize. He feels he is a person who has lost a certain amount of intellectual freedom as he is preoccupied with caution and is self-conscious around his peers.

REDACTED REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED has a fairly high degree of anxiety concerning female peers; he is unsure of himself and does not know how he should act. His male relationships and his definition of who he is as a male person are characterized by doubt and anger; he is unsure of what to expect of men, especially older men.

It is requested that a \$175,000.00 settlement be put into a structure that would pay out on REDACTED 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st, and 22nd birthdays as well as his 25th and 30th birthdays. Initial payments would cover attorney's fees and costs. The initial 18th birthday payment will be delayed due to the time allotted for the Archdiocese to review the settlement proposal.

REDACTED

REDACTED has a [breach of contract action] arising out of St. Paschal's sponsorship for the camp for which the REDACTED family paid. REDACTED was molested at camp. Defendant's demurrer to that cause of action was overruled. REDACTED seeks emotional stress damages as well as damages arising out of the costs the family has incurred in order to have REDACTED undergo psychological therapy.

Mrs. REDACTED herself has suffered deeply from the events which occurred at the camp. REDACTED seven month repression of the events, as noted above, produced a severe and destructive personality change. REDACTED teachers and principal brought this change to Mrs. REDACTED attention prior to REDACTED revelation of the assault and Mrs. REDACTED was at a loss to explain it. As discussed above, REDACTED became distant from all the family members, especially his father, and this caused the entire family anguish.

Mrs. REDACTED could be described as "a strong Catholic" prior to these events. Her faith has been shaken. As noted, she was reassured by Father O'Ryan that the matter would be taken care of and dropped criminal charges because of those reassurances. After that, more children were molested by Father Roemer and had she not dropped the charges, the molestations probably would not have occurred. Mrs. REDACTED resigned from St. Paschal's parish, leaving friends and roots. She joined a Newbury Park parish.

Most distressing to Mrs. REDACTED has been not only her questioning of faith in the lack of response on the part of the Church, but enduring REDACTED rejection of faith and the seemingly permanent changes in his personality. Settlement in the amount of \$50,000.00 is requested.

The above demand offers are good until October 24, 1986. I
look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
REDACTED
REI

REDACTED

July 1, 1987

REDACTED CASE

TOTAL BILLINGS

REDACTED

\$ 5,755.90

33,133.57

15,905.50

GRAND TOTAL

\$54,794.97

Home phone Roemer

REDACTED

6624



THE ARCHDIOCESE OF SAN FRANCISCO
PASTORAL CENTER

MAY 1988

THE TRIBUNAL

445 CHURCH STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94114-1799 (415) 565-3690

May 24, 1988

REDACTED

Our Lady Queen of the Angels' Seminary
P.O. Box 1071
San Fernando, CA 91341

Dear REDACTED

I do hope that this letter reaches you. After ten minutes on the phone to 1531 West Ninth Street, this was the only address that anyone could come up with; but it doesn't strike me as the one we had discussed.

I am enclosing in this letter two memoranda on the topics we had discussed concerning Pat. I hope that they will be helpful to you. One point that is not specifically covered in either memo is the question of a the period within which a penal action would have to be initiated against Pat. Presuming that an action would be instituted under canon 1395, §2, which states that "if a cleric has otherwise committed an offense against the sixth commandment of the Decalogue with force or threats or publicly or with a minor below the age of sixteen, the cleric is to be punished with just penalties, including dismissal from the clerical state if the case warrants it," the period of prescription (which is the term used in canon law for a "statute of limitations") is five years. This is based upon canon 1362, §1, n. 2, which states that "a criminal action is extinguished by prescription in three years unless it is a question of: . . . an action due to offenses mention in cann. 1394, 1395, 1397 and 1398, which have a prescription of five years."

Please don't hesitate to contact me if I can do anything to be of assistance to you or Pat in this matter.

REDACTED *Sincerely,*

REDACTED

Enclosures

6663

MEMORANDUM


DATE: June 21, 1988
FROM: Monsignor Curry ✓
TO: Archbishop Mahony
RE: Pat Roemer

I had a call from Father REDACTED, who does aftercare for the Paracletes in Jemez Springs. He had had a call from Pat Roemer asking for information about the Congregation.

Pat said he was calling to say that he and some other priests were interested in the work of the Congregation, and I fathered he had the possibility of joining in mind.

I told Father REDACTED that we were encouraging Pat to seek laicization.

Yes! + RMM
6-21-88





THE ARCHDIOCESE OF SAN FRANCISCO
PASTORAL CENTER

THE TRIBUNAL

445 CHURCH STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94114-1799 (415) 565-3690

July 14, 1988

Most Reverend Roger M. Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Dear Archbishop Mahony,

I am writing on the behalf of Reverend D. Patrick Roemer who has asked me to act as his canonical advocate in the hope of resolving certain difficulties which have arisen in his relationship with the Church of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. Father Roemer has attempted to initiate a dialogue with you on at least three occasions; however, these efforts on his part have been quite frustrating to him in that he has not been successful in reaching you. I am, therefore, approaching you on his behalf in the hope that a dialogue can be begun. This letter outlines the concerns which he wishes to bring to your attention.

Father Roemer remains dedicated to the priesthood to which he was ordained; but he is also fully aware of the difficulties which his past conduct has caused the Church of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, and he acknowledges the impossibility of his serving as a priest in the Archdiocese in the future. He has currently completed five of the ten years of the summary probation determined by the courts; and as he begins the latter half of this probation, he is most anxious to make plans for the future. In order to accomplish this, however, there are a number of personal matters which must be resolved.

While he does not wish to be a source of embarrassment or difficulty to the Archdiocese, it does appear that certain of Father Roemer's rights under canon law have been ignored. These continue to be a source of stress and severe hardship for him; and a remedy must be sought if he is to implement any future plans successfully.

It is helpful to present a chronology of the events surrounding Father Roemer's situation and to present a number of principles contained in canon law:

A. A CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS

1. On January 26, 1981, Father Roemer was placed under arrest by the authorities in Ventura County for child molestation. At no time did Father deny the accuracy of these charges.
2. Shortly after the time of his arrest, Father was placed on "inactive leave," and his faculties were removed. Since it appears that no penal process was followed, it seems that this was an administrative

6654

Most Reverend Roger M. Mahony
July 14, 1988

Page 2

action. At the same time, the Archdiocese arranged for Father Roemer to have one hour of therapy a week until the time of his sentencing on May 29, 1981.

3. On May 29, 1981, Father was sentenced to ten years at Atascadero State Hospital. A few months following his incarceration, Monsignor Hawkes informed Father that his salary was to be discontinued. This decision continues to remain in effect.
4. On April 11, 1983, Father Roemer was released from Atascadero State Hospital and was placed on his own recognizance until the court determined the conditions of his probation. For six weeks he was in residence at St. Joseph's Hospital in Ojai, California.
5. On May 25, 1983, Father was placed on summary probation for ten years, the probation which he is currently serving.
6. Following the hearing which placed him on probation, the Archdiocese provided Father with a used car and subsequently reimbursed him approximately \$1,100 for numerous repairs which had to be made on the vehicle. It is also clear that the Archdiocese paid for all of Father Roemer's legal expenses which were associated with his arrest on the child molestation charges; and the Archdiocese also arranged a financial settlement for one of the victims of Father's actions.
7. Since his release, Father Roemer has himself been responsible for a number of medical, legal and personal obligations which he has incurred. Due to the difficulties which surround his circumstances, it has been extremely difficult for him to find steady or permanent employment; and this has resulted in his accumulating outstanding debts in excess of \$15,000. He currently is unable to meet his monthly expenses, and the amount of his indebtedness continues to increase. From 1983 to the present time, Father Roemer has received no additional financial or pastoral assistance from the Archdiocese of Los Angeles; and he has been unsuccessful in his attempts to approach the Archdiocese for assistance.

B. CANONICAL PRINCIPLES

1. Canon 281 provides that clerics, since they dedicate themselves to the ecclesiastical ministry, deserve a remuneration which is consistent with their condition in accord with the nature of their responsibilities and with the conditions of time and place. This precept also directs that such remuneration should enable clerics to provide for their needs and for the equitable payment of those whose services they need, and that provision is to be made for assistance of those needs resulting from illness, incapacity or old age.
2. Canon 1350 presents the principle that even when (canonical) penalties are imposed upon a cleric, provision must be made that he not lack those things necessary for his decent support. Even in the

6655

Most Reverend Roger M. Mahony
July 14, 1988

Page 3

case of dismissal from the clerical state, an obligation in charity remains to assist a person who is truly in need.

3. Canon 6 states that with the promulgation of the 1983 Code of Canon Law, the 1917 Code of Canon Law, universal or particular laws contrary to the current code and universal or particular penal laws issued by the Apostolic See unless contained in the current code are abrogated.

The circumstances in which Father Roemer finds himself unquestionably call into question his ability to function in the priestly ministry at the present time in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. His condition represents a most serious problem for which he is undergoing continuing therapy and observation. Canon law, however, does not provide for the discontinuation of all support solely due to a priest's incapacity to function. It is clear that the principles concerning remuneration insist that an obligation exists in justice to provide for a priest suffering from illness. It would appear that the complete removal of financial support on the part of the Archdiocese would be a denial of Father Roemer's rights under canon 281.

Father Roemer has never been placed under a penalty by the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. Even if the "inactive leave" which was imposed at the time of his arrest in 1981 were construed to be a penalty, this certainly could not constitute dismissal from the clerical state. One might argue that the 1917 Code of Canon Law would allow for the "privation of a benefice," thus justifying the privation of Father's salary; however, with the promulgation of the current code, such a sanction would have been abrogated. Short of dismissal from the clerical state, which is not applicable in this case, an obligation in justice continues to exist to provide for Father's needs.

Even though Father Roemer does recognize and acknowledge that there is no possibility of his being able to function as a priest within the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, it will not be possible for him to pursue seriously any future plans as long as he is handicapped by the personal indebtedness under which he is laboring at this time.

It is the purpose of this letter to ask that Father Roemer's rights as a priest under canon law be acknowledged and that he be offered the basic assistance which these rights guarantee. In order to initiate a dialogue and arrive at an equitable resolution of this matter, we would make the following proposals:

1. That a mutually agreed to process be determined which will provide for a full examination of Father Roemer's rights under canon law given the unique circumstances in which he finds himself;
2. That provision be made for continuing medical and psychological treatment until that time when Father Roemer is personally able to assume these responsibilities;

6656

Most Reverend Roger M. Mahony
July 14, 1988

Page 4

3. That a schedule of financial compensation be established to provide for Father Roemer's basic needs which will not only alleviate his past indebtedness but which will allow him to pursue in a serious manner plans for the future.

It is hoped that this letter will serve as a means by which a serious dialogue may be begun in a spirit of charity and pastoral sensitivity, as it is Father Roemer's desire that an equitable solution be found to the questions which he is raising.

I thank you for the serious consideration which you will give to this matter.

REDACTED

cc: Reverend D. Patrick Roemer

6657



THE ARCHDIOCESE OF SAN FRANCISCO
PASTORAL CENTER

THE TRIBUNAL

445 CHURCH STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94114-1799 (415) 565-3690

July 14, 1988

Most Reverend Roger M. Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Dear Archbishop Mahony,

I am writing on the behalf of Reverend D. Patrick Roemer who has asked me to act as his canonical advocate in the hope of resolving certain difficulties which have arisen in his relationship with the Church of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. Father Roemer has attempted to initiate a dialogue with you on at least three occasions; however, these efforts on his part have been quite frustrating to him in that he has not been successful in reaching you. I am, therefore, approaching you on his behalf in the hope that a dialogue can be begun. This letter outlines the concerns which he wishes to bring to your attention.

Father Roemer remains dedicated to the priesthood to which he was ordained; but he is also fully aware of the difficulties which his past conduct has caused the Church of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, and he acknowledges the impossibility of his serving as a priest in the Archdiocese in the future. He has currently completed five of the ten years of the summary probation determined by the courts; and as he begins the latter half of this probation, he is most anxious to make plans for the future. In order to accomplish this, however, there are a number of personal matters which must be resolved.

While he does not wish to be a source of embarrassment or difficulty to the Archdiocese, it does appear that certain of Father Roemer's rights under canon law have been ignored. These continue to be a source of stress and severe hardship for him; and a remedy must be sought if he is to implement any future plans successfully.

It is helpful to present a chronology of the events surrounding Father Roemer's situation and to present a number of principles contained in canon law:

A. A CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS

1. On January 26, 1981, Father Roemer was placed under arrest by the authorities in Ventura County for child molestation. At no time did Father deny the accuracy of these charges.
2. Shortly after the time of his arrest, Father was placed on "inactive leave," and his faculties were removed. Since it appears that no penal process was followed, it seems that this was an administrative

6938

REDACTED

Bishop M. Mahony

Page 2

July 14, 1988

action. At the same time, the Archdiocese arranged for Father Roemer to have one hour of therapy a week until the time of his sentencing on May 29, 1981.

3. On May 29, 1981, Father was sentenced to ten years at Atascadero State Hospital. A few months following his incarceration, Monsignor Hawkes informed Father that his salary was to be discontinued. This decision continues to remain in effect.
4. On April 11, 1983, Father Roemer was released from Atascadero State Hospital and was placed on his own recognizance until the court determined the conditions of his probation. For six weeks he was in residence at St. Joseph's Hospital in Ojai, California.
5. On May 25, 1983, Father was placed on summary probation for ten years, the probation which he is currently serving.
6. Following the hearing which placed him on probation, the Archdiocese provided Father with a used car and subsequently reimbursed him approximately \$1,100 for numerous repairs which had to be made on the vehicle. It is also clear that the Archdiocese paid for all of Father Roemer's legal expenses which were associated with his arrest on the child molestation charges; and the Archdiocese also arranged a financial settlement for one of the victims of Father's actions.
7. Since his release, Father Roemer has himself been responsible for a number of medical, legal and personal obligations which he has incurred. Due to the difficulties which surround his circumstances, it has been extremely difficult for him to find steady or permanent employment; and this has resulted in his accumulating outstanding debts in excess of \$15,000. He currently is unable to meet his monthly expenses, and the amount of his indebtedness continues to increase. From 1983 to the present time, Father Roemer has received no additional financial or pastoral assistance from the Archdiocese of Los Angeles; and he has been unsuccessful in his attempts to approach the Archdiocese for assistance.

B. CANONICAL PRINCIPLES

1. Canon 281 provides that clerics, since they dedicate themselves to the ecclesiastical ministry, deserve a remuneration which is consistent with their condition in accord with the nature of their responsibilities and with the conditions of time and place. This precept also directs that such remuneration should enable clerics to provide for their needs and for the equitable payment of those whose services they need, and that provision is to be made for assistance of those needs resulting from illness, incapacity or old age.
2. Canon 1350 presents the principle that even when (canonical) penalties are imposed upon a cleric, provision must be made that he not lack those things necessary for his decent support. Even in the

6939

REDACTED oger M. Mahony
July 14, 1988

Page 3

case of dismissal from the clerical state, an obligation in charity remains to assist a person who is truly in need.

3. Canon 6 states that with the promulgation of the 1983 Code of Canon Law, the 1917 Code of Canon Law, universal or particular laws contrary to the current code and universal or particular penal laws issued by the Apostolic See unless contained in the current code are abrogated.

The circumstances in which Father Roemer finds himself unquestionably call into question his ability to function in the priestly ministry at the present time in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. His condition represents a most serious problem for which he is undergoing continuing therapy and observation. Canon law, however, does not provide for the discontinuation of all support solely due to a priest's incapacity to function. It is clear that the principles concerning remuneration insist that an obligation exists in justice to provide for a priest suffering from illness. It would appear that the complete removal of financial support on the part of the Archdiocese would be a denial of Father Roemer's rights under canon 281.

Father Roemer has never been placed under a penalty by the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. Even if the "inactive leave" which was imposed at the time of his arrest in 1981 were construed to be a penalty, this certainly could not constitute dismissal from the clerical state. One might argue that the 1917 Code of Canon Law would allow for the "privation of a benefice," thus justifying the privation of Father's salary; however, with the promulgation of the current code, such a sanction would have been abrogated. Short of dismissal from the clerical state, which is not applicable in this case, an obligation in justice continues to exist to provide for Father's needs.

Even though Father Roemer does recognize and acknowledge that there is no possibility of his being able to function as a priest within the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, it will not be possible for him to pursue seriously any future plans as long as he is handicapped by the personal indebtedness under which he is laboring at this time.

It is the purpose of this letter to ask that Father Roemer's rights as a priest under canon law be acknowledged and that he be offered the basic assistance which these rights guarantee. In order to initiate a dialogue and arrive at an equitable resolution of this matter, we would make the following proposals:

1. That a mutually agreed to process be determined which will provide for a full examination of Father Roemer's rights under canon law given the unique circumstances in which he finds himself;
2. That provision be made for continuing medical and psychological treatment until that time when Father Roemer is personally able to assume these responsibilities;

6940

REDACTED

Jer M. Mahony

Page 4

July 14, 1988

3. That a schedule of financial compensation be established to provide for Father Roemer's basic needs which will not only alleviate his past indebtedness but which will allow him to pursue in a serious manner plans for the future.

It is hoped that this letter will serve as a means by which a serious dialogue may be begun in a spirit of charity and pastoral sensitivity, as it is Father Roemer's desire that an equitable solution be found to the questions which he is raising.

I thank you for the serious consideration which you will give to this matter.

Sincerely yours in Christ
REDACTED

cc: Reverend D. Patrick Roemer

6941

MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 29, 1988
FROM: Monsignor Curry
TO: Archbishop Mahony
RE: Attached re Patrick Roemer

REDACTED REDACTED will be responding directly to you
on this.
REDACTED

I will be very willing to help with this if I can.

REDACTED

REFERRAL MEMORANDUM FROM ARCHBISHOP ROGER MAHONY

Date: 8-13-88TO: Fr. Curry

- (X) Please review, then SEE me
() Please review, then RETURN to me
() Please review, then SEND me your COMMENTS
() Please review, then FILE

- () Please handle this matter entirely
() Please answer; send copy of letter to me
() Please write a reply for my signature
() For your information

- () Please XEROX and send copy/copies to: _____

- () original to file
() original back to me

REMARKS: _____

Thanks!

6651



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES

1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
(213) 251-3288

Office of the Archbishop

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

August 17, 1988

Reverend D. Patrick Roemer
REDACTED
The Tribunal
Archdiocese of San Francisco
445 Church Street
San Francisco, CA 94114

Dear Father Roemer:

I have received a letter from Father REDACTED dated July 14, 1988 with respect to your current status and situation.

In the letter from Father REDACTED there are some canons from the Code of Canon Law quoted. However, other equally important canons are omitted, and I believe that it is important that we all understand your canonical status in a fuller sense.

I am somewhat puzzled by Father REDACTED assertion that you tried to meet with me on three separate occasions and were not permitted to do so. I would be willing to meet with you in the near future and I would ask that you make the necessary arrangements through Monsignor Thomas Curry, my Vicar for the Clergy.

When that appointment is arranged, I can then outline for you my understanding of the canonical provisions, including your financial liability towards the families and young people who have been so severely damaged through your own personal conduct.

With every best wish, I am

Sincerely yours in Christ,

+ Rmm

Most Reverend Roger Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles

cc: Monsignor Thomas Curry

eb

6650



THE ARCHDIOCESE OF SAN FRANCISCO
PASTORAL CENTER

THE TRIBUNAL

445 CHURCH STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94114-1799 (415) 565-3690

August 22, 1988

Most Reverend Roger Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015-1194

Dear Archbishop Mahony,

I am writing to acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 17 to Father Roemer. I will forward the letter to him today.

I thank you for your response. I know that Father Roemer is looking forward to the opportunity of meeting with you.

REDACTED

cc: Reverend D. Patrick Roemer

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 29, 1988
FROM: Monsignor Thomas Curry ✓
TO: Archbishop Mahony
RE: Pat Roemer

I called Pat about setting up an appointment, and we have set it tentatively for Tuesday, October 4 at 10:30 A.M.

Pat requested that Father REDACTED the canonist who has been advising him, be present, and I told him I would have to check that with you.

yes! / REDACTED

If this is agreeable to you, I will confirm the appointment.

REDACTED

*Please see me.
+ RkH
8-29-88*

MEMORANDUMSeptember 1, 1988

TO: Archbishop Mahony

FROM: Monsignor Thomas Curry ✓

RE: Pat Roemer

Father REDACTED the canonist who is representing Pat Roemer, called me today about the appointment with you. He insists he must be present since he claims your letter indicates that you will be discussing some canonical matters at the meeting.

I had checked with REDACTED and found that November 22 at 3 P.M. would be available, and he was agreeable to that date. However, I stressed that you wished to stay with the October 4 date and that I could not agree to a change without verifying it with you.

My sense is that Pat Roemer will not come now on his own. He was to call me back to say if he would come on Oct 4 but had Father REDACTED make the call.

*Let's go with the Nov. 22nd
date -*

Thanks!

+ RMM

9-1-88

6647

for REDACTED -

November 22
3 pm.

ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
(213) 251-3200

OFFICE OF VICAR FOR CLERGY
(213) 251-3284

September 7, 1988

REDACTED

The Tribunal
445 Church St.
San Francisco, CA 94114-1799

Dear REDACTED

This will confirm the appointment for you and Father
Pat Roemer with Archbishop Mahony on

Tuesday, November 22, 1988 at 3 P.M.

With warmest best wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

(Rev. Msgr.) Thomas J. Curry
Vicar for Clergy

REDACTED

cc: Rev. D. Patrick Roemer



THE ARCHDIOCESE OF SAN FRANCISCO
PASTORAL CENTER

THE TRIBUNAL

445 CHURCH STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94114-1799 (415) 565-3690

September 10, 1988

Reverend Monsignor Thomas J. Curry
Vicar for Clergy
Archdiocese of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015-1194

Dear Monsignor Curry,

This letter is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of September 7 in which you confirm the November 22 appointment of Father Roemer and myself with Archbishop Mahony. We understand that this appointment will be at 3:00 p.m. at the Chancery office.

May I thank you for your assistance in arranging an appointment which avoids the calendar conflicts all of us were experiencing.

REDACTED

cc: Reverend D. Patrick Roemer
REDACTED

6645

CCI 003209

MEMORANDUMDecember 12, 1988

TO: Archbishop Mahony
FROM: Monsignor Thomas Curry
RE: Attached Memo re Pat Roemer

Pat has never been formally suspended. I spoke to Monsignor Rawden, and he explained that if a priest did not have an assignment he was in the same position as if he had been suspended. Attached is a copy of your letter of October 7, 1985 asking him to continue on inactive leave.

REDACTED

REDACTED

Much of the material pertaining to Pat is in a confidential file in my office. REDACTED
REDACTED

MEMORANDUM**CONFIDENTIAL**

DATE: December 12, 1988
FROM: Monsignor Curry
TO: Monsignor REDACTED
RE: Rev. Patrick Roemer

I will be at the Priests Council this morning, but will be back in the office this afternoon and would very much appreciate it if you could give me a call regarding the matter of suspension.

I talked to REDACTED Rawden, and his policy was that if a priest did not have an appointment in the Archdiocese that, in his mind, was the equivalent of suspension--and since the matter of Pat Roemer has come to light he has not had an appointment in the Archdiocese.

Many thanks.

*(1342.2°) Perpetual Penalties cannot be inflicted
1044.2° 2. Impeded from the exercise of orders.*

MEMORANDUMDecember 12, 1988

TO: Archbishop Mahony
FROM: Monsignor Thomas Curry
RE: Attached Memo re Pat Roemer

Pat has never been formally suspended. I spoke to Monsignor Rawden, and he explained that if a priest did not have an assignment he was in the same position as if he had been suspended. Attached is a copy of your letter of October 7, 1985 asking him to continue on inactive leave.

REDACTED

Much of the material pertaining to Pat is in a confidential file in my office. REDACTED
REDACTED

REDACTED



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES

1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
(213) 251-3288

Office of the Archbishop

December 20, 1988

Patrick Roemer
REDACTED

Dear Patrick:

At our recent meeting held at the Chancery Office on Tuesday, November 22, 1988 it was suggested that no formal action was taken by the Archdiocese of Los Angeles to suspend you from priestly activity.

I am writing to recall for your information my letter dated October 7, 1985 in which I repeated the status which you had prior to my arrival in the Archdiocese, and which you still have, namely "inactive leave." Although you have not been canonically suspended, in view of Canon 1044 #2, paragraph 2, you are impeded from the exercise of your orders.

I would once again recommend strongly that your next steps include a formal petition to our Holy Father seeking an immediate return to the lay state. I would fully concur in that petition, and I am quite confident that it would be granted almost immediately.


With every best wish, I am

Sincerely yours in Christ,

+ *Roger Mahony*
Most Reverend Roger Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles

cc: Monsignor Thomas Curry
REDACTED

REDACTED



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES

1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
(213) 251-3288

Office of the Archbishop

December 20, 1988

Patrick Roemer
REDACTED

Dear Patrick:

At our recent meeting held at the Chancery Office on Tuesday, November 22, 1988 it was suggested that no formal action was taken by the Archdiocese of Los Angeles to suspend you from priestly activity.

I am writing to recall for your information my letter dated October 7, 1985 in which I repeated the status which you had prior to my arrival in the Archdiocese, and which you still have. Your status is "inactive leave" and you are still under that heading.

I would point out that this particular status designation does not allow you to function as a Catholic priest in any way whatsoever. You should also realize that although you have not been canonically suspended, in view of Canon 1044 #2, paragraph 2, you are impeded from the exercise of your sacred orders.

I would once again recommend strongly that your next steps include a formal petition to our Holy Father seeking an immediate return to the lay state. I would fully concur in that petition, and I am quite confident that it would be granted almost immediately.

With every best wish, I am

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Most Reverend Roger Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles

cc: Monsignor Thomas Curry
REDACTED



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
(213) 251-3200

OFFICE OF VICAR FOR CLERGY
REDACTED

MEMORANDUM

January 6, 1989

TO: REDACTED REDACTED
Father REDACTED

FROM: REDACTED

RE: Father Patrick Roemer

Many thanks for meeting with REDACTED REDACTED and me this week. I am enclosing a copy of Father REDACTED letter of July 14 to Archbishop Mahony for your information. As both REDACTED REDACTED and I mentioned to you, Archbishop Mahony sees no possibility of Father Roemer returning to ministry in this Archdiocese, and he advises in the strongest possible manner against Father Roemer's seeking ministry elsewhere.

Given this situation, the Archdiocese asks you to meet with Father Roemer, give your assessment of his needs, and report back to Archbishop Mahony.

May I request that you contact Father Roemer at your earliest convenience.

Patrick Roemer
REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED REDACTED

- wrong # 6/28/89
- no more 6/28/89

Many thanks.

cc: Patrick Roemer

REDACTED

January 7, 1989

Most Reverend Roger Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015-1194

Dear Archbishop Mahony,

I am in receipt of your letter of December 20, 1988, in which you recall our meeting of November 22, 1988. I understand from your action that it is your wish that I not exercise the priestly ministry. May I point out that I have always honored the requirements of the "inactive leave" on which I was placed in 1981.

At our November meeting, I was given to understand that you would initiate a pastoral examination into the difficulties I have been experiencing since my release from the Atascadero State Hospital in April 1983. This was also to include an examination of the future plans I wish to consider and the assistance which I would need in order to implement them. You indicated that you would expedite this process and would also provide me with a written memorandum of understanding concerning the process which you had proposed. I am most desirous that the process be begun as soon as possible so that I can begin formulating my future plans.

I look forward to hearing from you concerning these arrangements.

Sincerely,



Patrick Roemer

cc: Reverend Msgr. Thomas Curry
REDACTED

REDACTED

Sunday 1-8-89

Dear Monique Curry,

I received your memorandum - copy -
yesterday, - thank - I am grateful that
this process is underway!

I'll look forward to being
contacted by REDACTED REDACTED and

REDACTED. However, the telephone
number listed for my home is
not correct. It should read:

REDACTED

I hope and pray that 1989
is a grand year for us all.

Sincerely,

Pete Roemer

Called REDACTED

on
1/14/89 - I am in contact with
left message for Frances
Pete Roemer, etc 1/14/89

6936

REDACTED Ph.D.
 REDACTED Licensed Psychologist
 REDACTED

February 15, 1989

TO: REDACTED REDACTED
 REDACTED REDACTED

RE: Father Patrick Roemer

I am writing this letter at the request of Reverend Patrick Roemer. I understand that you are examining Father. Roemer for Archbishop Mahoney, and that some question might arise about his suitability to conduct his priestly duties. Because I am a specialist in the area of sexual offenses, and, also, have been seeing Father Roemer in psychotherapy for approximately seven years, I believe that I am qualified to provide information which may be of assistance in your examination of his case.

Before I discuss any aspects of the case, perhaps it would be helpful for you to know something about my own background. I am a licensed psychologist in the State of California. REDACTED
 REDACTED

REDACTED Not only did my duties involve the treating of sex offenders, but also of children who had been sexually molested.

In 1981, I assumed a position as staff psychologist at the Atascadero State Hospital where I began working intensively with sex offenders and continue to do so up to the present time. In fact, my present assignments at the Atascadero State Hospital are quite relevant to my work on Father Roemer's case. Currently, I serve in two positions at the state hospital: the first is as a staff psychologist on the Sex Offender Treatment and Evaluation Project which is mandated by the California State Legislature to research the

ROEMER

page 2

treatment of sex offenders; the second, is as the coordinator of the Human Sexual Behavior Laboratory.

In addition to these activities, I have treated many pedophiles in my private practice, and have done extensive court and consulting work in this area. Finally, I served as Father Roemer's primary psychotherapist while he was at Atascadero State Hospital.

Before discussing the specifics of Father Roemer's case, perhaps it would be helpful to examine the diagnostic criteria concerning pedophilia which both the psychological and psychiatric professions employ. These criteria are discussed in the 3rd edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM III), and include the following: first, over a period of at least six months, the individual experiences recurrent urges and fantasies of sexual involvement with children; second, the individual must act out on these or be "markedly distressed" by them; third, the individual must be at least 16-years-old, and at least 5 years older than the child (except for a late adolescent boy who is sexually involved with a girl who is 12- or 13-years-old); fourth, the acting-out sexual behaviors must not be incidental to other conditions such as mental retardation, organic damage, schizophrenia, and drug intoxication.

REDACTED

In addition, there must be some consideration of the conditions under which he may be discharged from the hospital. Prior to a recommendation by the state hospital to the court that an individual be released, a multidisciplinary team is assembled. Typically, such a team is comprised of the treating psychiatrist, psychologist, social worker, and nursing staff. A team was assembled in Father Roemer's case, reviewed all of the clinical evidence which had accumulated while he was being treated at the hospital, and concluded that his ability to cope with stress was now sufficient, that his judgment was adequate, and that he no longer posed a risk to the community. In other words, the hospital formally reported to the court that in the judgment of its

6922

ROEMER

page 3

professional staff, Father Roemer had progressed to the point where he was able to cope with any inappropriate urges. That the court agreed is demonstrated by the fact that it allowed him to return to the community.

I believe that it is absolutely essential that the above information be understood in order to properly assess this case. What I mean by this is that scientific research has demonstrated that even normal men may also be aroused by pedophilic stimuli (heterosexual and/or homosexual). The difference between such men and the pedophile is not the fact of arousal but the acting out on that arousal. What the professional staff determined at the hospital, and what I have found as I monitor his progress subsequent to his discharge, is that Father Roemer is now capable of living his life with sufficient self-control.

In view of all of this information, I believe that it is reasonable to conclude that there are significant changes in Father Roemer's status such that he is no longer functioning psychologically as he did prior to his hospitalization. I believe that the psychological changes are qualitatively and quantitatively to such an extent that there are no reasons why he cannot discharge his priestly functions.

Please feel free to contact me if you wish further information, or would like to discuss any aspect of this case. Thank you for allowing me to be of service in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

REDACTED

REDACTED

Ph.D.

6923

CCI 003220

FILE

MEMORANDUMFebruary 21, 1989

TO: Archbishop Mahony
FROM: Monsignor Thomas Curry
RE: REDACTED

REDACTED

left for Ireland on Saturday as his father is seriously ill. He and REDACTED were scheduled to meet with Pat Roemer on Monday, February 20, so, unfortunately, that meeting had to be postponed.



THE ARCHDIOCESE OF SAN FRANCISCO
PASTORAL CENTER

THE TRIBUNAL

445 CHURCH STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94114-1799 (415) 565-3690

April 18, 1989

Reverend Msgr. Thomas Curry
Vicar for Clergy
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015-1194

Dear Monsignor Curry,

I am writing with regard to the situation concerning Reverend D. Patrick Roemer and in light of the fact that it has been over a month since our meeting with REDACTED REDACTED and Father REDACTED

Since there has been no communication with us since the time of our meeting on March 13, this letter is to inquire as to the status of the investigation into Father Roemer's needs and to ask when we might expect a decision from Archbishop Mahony in this matter.

Thank you for your attention to this inquiry.

Sincerely,
REDACTED

cc: Reverend D. Patrick Roemer



St. Joseph the Worker Parish

19850 Cantlay Street / Canoga Park / California 91306-3096

Phone: 1 REDACTED

April 21, 1989

Most Rev. Roger M. Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles
Chancery Office
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, CA. 90015

Dear Archbishop Mahony,

At your request we met with Rev. Patrick Roemer on March 13, to discuss the issues pertaining to his case as described in a letter to you from Reverend REDACTED dated July 14, 1988. We had a cordial meeting with the two of them. We pointed out to them that canonical matters were outside the scope and realm of this meeting. We were there as your representatives to assess his personal needs and to present you with our recommendations.

Based on that meeting, we would like to make the following observations. Fr. Roemer has a dream that he would like to return to active ministry somewhere, sometime, whether that be in some diocese or Religious Community. He is aware however of your feelings on the matter and we did not lend him any encouragement in that direction either.

In the event that that does not work out for him, he would like to return to school and pursue a degree. Evidently he is bright and scores well on tests. This of course involves money and clearance from the State for any kind of certificate or license. In the course of our discussion it was obvious that he cannot afford to go to school, so Fr. REDACTED suggested the possibility of a loan from the Archdiocese. We were not very enthusiastic about that idea, and asked what kind of program he had in mind, where he intended to pursue these studies, for how long and what this would cost.

A couple weeks later, we received a letter from Father REDACTED saying that Fr. Roemer had done some research and found a program at California State University Long Beach which is suited to his educational needs and suitable to the Probation Department, and that he could enroll for this fall's program as long as he meets the May 1, registration deadline.

The following are two paragraphs from that letter: "According to information provided by Cal State Long Beach, the total fees for a single student for the 1988 - 1989 academic year were estimated at approximately \$1,330. This includes university fees, books and supplies; and it presumes that the student would be living off campus. Father estimates that his monthly living expenses in the south bay area would be in the area of \$1,500. This presumes that he would be enrolled as a full-time student meaning that he would not have a source of income through employment during the two year program that he is envisioning.

Re: Rev. Patrick Roemer
Page 2.

Thus, the total costs over the period of two years (not taking into account cost of living increases, etc.) would be approximately \$38,660.

Were Father to have to undertake this program as a part-time student, there would be a significant escalation in the university fees; and the program would take a significantly longer period of time to complete."

These are his dreams. The present reality of the situation is that Fr. Roemer has a debt of over \$19,000, as of December 31, 1988. Almost \$11,000 of this is owed to Dr. REDACTED his therapist who charges \$95.00 for each weekly visit. Then he has borrowed \$8,000 from his mother and aunt. That figure does not reflect the 5.3% interest on \$3,000, 11.5% on \$2,000 and 5.5% on the remaining \$3,000. On top of this his present job will end on June 30, 1989 and neither will he have any insurance coverage.

In fairness to him, we would agree that his living expenses are not exorbitant, for example his monthly rent is only \$270. From the records he shared with us, it appears that he keeps his expenses to a minimum.

In evaluating Fr. Roemer's needs it would be our recommendation that the Archdiocese help him to retire the debt, which by now is probably in the neighborhood of \$20,000. Secondly, we do not consider his educational proposal as being realistic and would therefore recommend instead that the Archdiocese exercise its influence in helping him find a job that would meet his needs.

Thirdly, we recommend that the Archdiocese pay him a monthly salary of about \$800. during this transitional period. This is based on his current monthly expenses which he shared with us. Fourthly, we recommend that the Archdiocese give him Insurance coverage until he procures a job that will give him coverage.

We hope Archbishop that this input will be helpful to you in reaching a decision in this difficult matter. Assuring you of our willingness to be of any further help and with best wishes, we remain

Sincerely yours,
REDACTED

REDACTED REDACTED
REDACTED:DACTED

REFERRAL PERSONNEL: BISHOP ROGER MAHONY

Date: 4-25-89

TO: Msgr. Curry

- (X) Please review, then SEE me
() Please review, then RETURN to me
() Please review, then SEND me your COMMENTS
() Please review, then FILE

- () Please handle this matter entirely
() Please answer; send copy of letter to me
() Please write a reply for my signature
() For your information

- () Please XEROX and send copy/copies to: _____

- () original to file
() original back to me

REMARKS: _____

_____MS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 26, 1989
 FROM: Monsignor Curry
 TO: Archbishop Mahony
 RE: Pat Roemer

REDACTED sent copies of his letter to you to REDACTED and myself, and we both think the recommendations are reasonable and generous.

Yes
 We would advise going with these recommendations, but with the stipulation that the monthly salary be for a six-month period and that we all evaluate the situation at the end of that time.

Yes -
 In the past, REDACTED has indicated that the Archdiocese, by way of members of the Finance Council, might well be able to find a job, and with your permission I will pursue this with REDACTED

Unless you wish to do so, neither REDACTED nor I think it necessary for you to meet with Pat Roemer again, and we will be very willing to handle the matter if that is your wish.

REDACTED

cc: REDACTED REDACTED

Please make certain that all of this is in writing, that our limits are clear, etc. I believe we need to say that getting a real job now is also a high priority. May I please see the draft? Thanks! + RMM

4-26-89

6917

COPY



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
(213) 251-3200

OFFICE OF VICAR FOR CLERGY
(213) 251-3284

April 28, 1989

REDACTED

Archdiocese of San Francisco
Tribunal
445 Church Street
San Francisco, CA 94114-1799

Dear REDACTED

Thank you for your letter of April 18, 1989.

REDACTED REDACTED and Father REDACTED have, I believe, submitted their report to Archbishop Mahony recently.


Thus the Archdiocese will be in contact with you and Father Patrick Roemer very soon.

With personal best wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

(Rev. Msgr.) Thomas J. Curry
Vicar for Clergy

REDACTED



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES

1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
(213) 251-3288

Office of the Archbishop

April 29, 1989

Patrick Roemer
REDACTED

Dear Patrick:

REDACTED REDACTED and Father REDACTED have reported to me on their meeting of March 13 with you and REDACTED. Based on the report of that meeting, I am writing you with the following suggestions as to how the Archdiocese can be of assistance to you:

Although the report states you would like to pursue a degree course, I do not think it feasible for the Archdiocese to support you in such a venture. Rather, I strongly recommend that you seek employment by which you will be able to support yourself. In the event that you find it difficult to locate a job, the Archdiocese will be willing to work with you in this matter and to solicit the assistance of business people who are involved in the affairs of the Archdiocese.

During the period in which you are seeking employment, the Archdiocese will be willing to assist you in the amount of \$800 per month and to have you covered by the Archdiocesan health insurance. I propose such an arrangement for a six-month period, after which we would evaluate your situation.

The report also states that you are currently in debt as a result of therapy and having to borrow money from family members. To assist you, the Archdiocese will be willing to pay off this debt, which I understand is currently about \$20,000.

I hope these suggestions will be of help to you and look forward to hearing from you soon. I am aware that you had hoped to return to ministry, but as I emphasized to you previously, I do not see how that would be possible and I continue to advise you to petition the Holy Father for your return to the lay state. Again, I cannot stress too highly the importance of your finding a position that will enable you to support yourself and settle into a regular pattern of life.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Most Reverend Roger Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles

cc: REDACTED

6909

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 29, 1989
FROM: Monsignor Curry
TO: Archbishop Mahony
RE: Pat Roemer

Attached is draft of a letter to Pat Roemer. On reflection, I propose that the letter come from you.

Please let me know if it needs any additions or corrections.

I did check with REDACTED about the possibility of finding employment and he is optimistic about that.

I am returning the original letter to you from REDACTED and REDACTED as you may need it for your reply to them. I think they did a really fine job on this.

6908



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
 1531 WEST NINTH STREET
 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
 (213) 251-3288

Office of the Archbishop

May 1, 1989

MEMORANDUM

TO: Msgr. Thomas Curry
 FROM: Archbishop Roger Mahony + RMM
 SUBJECT: PATRICK ROEMER

While I agree with the general approach, I feel strongly--maybe too strongly!--that something needs to be said clearly in this letter about the background of the case.

I believe that reference needs to be made to the extraordinarily serious actions of Pat, the enormous monies the AD paid out for his attorneys, the large sums we had to pay the families, etc.

Following this brief overview summary, I then think the focus should be on his getting a job--a real job. We should indicate that the Church has already spent enormous sums of money getting him one professional career already, and he blew it. The Church carries no such obligation to now prepare him through schooling for another career.

I know this sounds a bit harsh, but I believe that our letter (since it will be the first such written word to him) should recap some of the history in order to place the proper context.

THANKS SO VERY MUCH FOR REVIEWING MY IDEAS--I WOULD WELCOME THE OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS ALL OF THIS WITH YOU!

6907

Dear Patrick:

REDACTED REDACTED and Father REDACTED have reported to me on their meeting of March 13, 1989 with you and Father REDACTED. Based on this report, I hope the Archdiocese will be able to assist you to become truly independent and self-supporting.

Became of the extraordinary seriousness of your actions in the past, I do not believe you could ever be appointed to a position of priestly ministry in this Archdiocese, and neither could I recommend you to another Diocese. My understanding is that you have taken your therapy very seriously and have made substantial progress in dealing with the problems in your own life that have given rise to the present difficulties, and I am very thankful for this and will continue to hope and pray for your continued recovery.

However, your actions have had a devastating impact on numerous people, and the effects of these actions will remain with them for the duration of their lifetimes. Without making any judgment on your own present recovery, the Church must be aware of the feelings and sentiments of all those who know of your past. To restore you to a position of priestly ministry would be to invite a continuing reminder to the people who were immediately involved of what was a very bitter experience, and to a much wider audience of what was a terribly painful episode in the Church community. I raise these matters not to accuse you again about incidents that had a disastrous effect on your own life, but to state something that pertains very much to both your and our responsibilities to our Catholic people in this local Church.

As the Archdiocese seeks to ascertain your real needs for the future, I believe we need to carry on our discussions within a context of understanding of what has already taken place. To date, the lawyers' fees amount to a figure in the region of \$60,000. Because of your actions, the Archdiocese was exposed to grave civil liability and has already reached settlements involving substantial sums of money with a number of people. While the details of these settlements are protected by confidentiality, the Archdiocese has been advised that our exposure to liability is not yet complete, and that there are possibly others who may come forward.

At this stage, I would like to emphasize my strong conviction that you should seek employment with a view to being able to support yourself adequately and completely. Although the report from REDACTED REDACTED and Father REDACTED states that you would like to pursue a degree course, I do not wish to commit the Archdiocese to such a venture. Rather, I wish to see you devote your full attention to seeking employment. To this end, the Archdiocese would be willing, if necessary, to seek the advice of business people who are involved in the affairs of the Archdiocese.

During the period in which you are seeking employment, the Archdiocese will be willing to assist you in the amount of \$800 per month and to have you covered by the Archdiocesan health insurance.

I propose such an arrangement for a six-month period, after which we would both evaluate your situation.

The report from REDACTED REDACTED and Father REDACTED also states that you are currently in debt as a result of therapy and having to borrow money from family members. To assist you, the Archdiocese will be willing to pay off this debt, which I understand is currently about \$20,000. ↗

I hope these suggestions will be of help to you and look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely yours in Xt,
RMM

This payment is by way of a gift to you, and implies no other liability past, present, or future. The Archdiocese would not be in a position to assume any other bills which you might incur in the future.

MEMORANDUM

May 10, 1989

TO: Archbishop Mahony

FROM: Monsignor Thomas Curry

RE: Pat Roemer

Attached is a revised draft of a letter to Pat Roemer. Please let me know if this is in line with your thinking and do not hesitate to make any changes or suggestions.

I very much agree with you that whatever we do need to be put in the context of the background of the case, and I also see the importance of stating some facts and issues for the record in the future.

*Excellent letter!! Please put the
one addition I made on p. 2. Please
have typed for my signature. Send
via certified mail, return card.*

Thanked

+ RAC

5-12-89

6904

COPY

REDACTED

ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES

1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
(213) 251-3288

May 17, 1989

Patrick Roemer
REDACTED

Dear Patrick:

Monsignor REDACTED and Father REDACTED : have reported to me on their meeting of March 13, 1989 with you and Father REDACTED. Based on this report, I hope the Archdiocese of Los Angeles will be able to assist you to become truly independent and self-supporting.

Because of the extraordinary seriousness of your actions in the past, I do not believe you could ever be appointed to a position of priestly ministry in this Archdiocese, and neither could I recommend you to another Diocese. My understanding is that you have taken your therapy very seriously and have made substantial progress in dealing with the problems in your own life that have given rise to the present difficulties, and I am very thankful for this and will continue to hope and pray for your continued recovery.

However, your actions have had a devastating impact on numerous people, and the effects of these actions will remain with them for the duration of their lifetimes. Without making any judgment on your own present recovery, the Church must be aware of the feelings and sentiments of all those who know of your past. To restore you to a position of priestly ministry would be to invite a continuing reminder to the people who were immediately involved of what was a very bitter experience, and to a much wider audience of what was a terribly painful episode in the Church community. I raise these matters not to accuse you again about incidents that had a disastrous effect on your own life, but to state something that pertains very much to both your and our responsibilities to our Catholic people in this Local Church.

As the Archdiocese seeks to ascertain your real needs for the future, I believe we need to carry on our discussions within a context of understanding of what has already taken place. To date, the lawyers' fees amount to a figure in the region of \$60,000. Because of your actions, the Archdiocese was exposed to grave civil liability and has already reached settlements involving substantial sums of money with a number of people. While the details of these settlements are protected by confidentiality, the Archdiocese has been advised that our exposure to liability is not yet complete, and that there are possibly others who may come forward.

Patrick Roemer

--2

At this stage, I would like to emphasize my strong conviction that you should seek employment with a view to being able to support yourself adequately and completely. Although the report from REDACTED REDACTED and REDACTED states that you would like to pursue a degree course, I do not wish to commit the Archdiocese to such a venture. Rather, I wish to see you devote your full attention to seeking employment. To this end, the Archdiocese would be willing, if necessary, to seek the advice of business people who are involved in the affairs of the Archdiocese.


During the period in which you are seeking employment, the Archdiocese will be willing to assist you in the amount of \$800 per month and to have you covered by the Archdiocesan health insurance. I propose such an arrangement for a six-month period, after which we would both evaluate your situation.

The report from REDACTED REDACTED and Father REDACTED also states that you are currently in debt as a result of therapy and having to borrow money from family members. To assist you, the Archdiocese will be willing to pay off this debt, which I understand is currently about \$20,000.

This payment is by way of a gift to you, and implies no other liability past, present, or future. The Archdiocese would not be in a position to assume any other bills which you might incur in future.

I hope these suggestions will be of help to you and look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

+ 
Most Reverend Roger Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles

cc: Rev. REDACTED

6899

CCI 003237

SENDER: Complete items 1 and 2 when additional services are desired, and complete items 3 and 4.

Put your address in the "RETURN TO" space on the reverse side. Please do so, the firm, person, or item being returned to you. The return receipt will be sent to the address of the postmaster and the date of delivery. For additional fees the following services are available. Consult postmaster for fees and check boxes for additional service(s) requested.

1. ☐ Show to whom delivered, date, and addressee's address. 2. ☐ Restricted Delivery (Extra charge)

3. Article Addressed to: **DATRICK ROEMER**

4. Article Number: **P 112 515 431**

REDACTED

Type of Service: ☐ Registered ☐ Insured ☒ Certified ☐ COD ☐ Express Mail ☐ Return Receipt for Merchandise

Always obtain signature of addressee or agent and DATE DELIVERED.

5. Signature - Address: *Patrick Roemer*

Signature - Agent

Date of Delivery: *5-18-89*

Form 3811, Mar. 1988 * U.S.G.P.O. 1988-212-865 DOMESTIC RETURN RECEIPT

6900

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
OFFICIAL BUSINESS



PENALTY FOR RETURN TO OFFICE

SENDER INSTRUCTIONS
Print your name, address and ZIP Code in the space below.
1. Complete items 1, 2, 3, and 4 on the reverse.
2. Attach to front of article if space permits; otherwise affix to back of article.
3. Indicate article "Return Receipt" adjacent to number 1.

REDACTED

1531 WEST NINTH ST.
LOS ANGELES CA 90015

6901

P 116 515 431

RECEIPT FOR CERTIFIED MAIL

NO INSURANCE COVERAGE PROVIDED
NOT FOR INTERNATIONAL MAIL

(See Reverse)


PS Form 3800, Feb. 1982
* U.S.G.P.O. 1984-468-014

Sent to PATRICK ROEHER	
Street and No. REDACTED	
City and State REDACTED	
Postage	\$ 25
Certified Fee	85
Special Delivery Fee	
Restricted Delivery Fee	
Return Receipt Showing to whom and Date Delivered	90
Return receipt showing to whom, Date, and Address of Delivery	
TOTAL Postage and Fees	\$ 2.00
Postmark or Date	

6902

**STICK POSTAGE STAMPS TO ARTICLE TO COVER FIRST-CLASS POSTAGE.
CERTIFIED MAIL FEE, AND CHARGES FOR ANY SELECTED OPTIONAL SERVICES. (see front)**


- 1. If you want this receipt postmarked, stick the gummed strip on the left portion of the address side of the article to be sent. (See sample.)
- 2. If you do not want a postmark, do not attach it.
- 3. If you want a return receipt, attach Form 3811 and attach to it a label with the following words: "Return Receipt Requested".
- 4. If you want delivery restricted delivery, attach Form 3811 and attach to it a label with the following words: "Restricted Delivery".
- 5. If you have the squares required in the appropriate squares on the front of this receipt. If return receipt is requested, attach the appropriate label to item 1 of Form 3811.
- 6. If you have the receipt and present it if you make inquiry.



the address side of the
in a return receipt card,
otherwise, attach
to the number
the address, endorse

6903

COPY



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
 1531 WEST NINTH STREET
 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
 (213) 251-3288

Office of the Archbishop

May 17, 1989

Patrick Roemer
 REDACTED

Dear Patrick:

REDACTED REDACTED and Father REDACTED have reported to me on their meeting of March 13, 1989 with you and Father REDACTED. Based on this report, I hope the Archdiocese of Los Angeles will be able to assist you to become truly independent and self-supporting.

Because of the extraordinary seriousness of your actions in the past, I do not believe you could ever be appointed to a position of priestly ministry in this Archdiocese, and neither could I recommend you to another Diocese. My understanding is that you have taken your therapy very seriously and have made substantial progress in dealing with the problems in your own life that have given rise to the present difficulties, and I am very thankful for this and will continue to hope and pray for your continued recovery.

However, your actions have had a devastating impact on numerous people, and the effects of these actions will remain with them for the duration of their lifetimes. Without making any judgment on your own present recovery, the Church must be aware of the feelings and sentiments of all those who know of your past. To restore you to a position of priestly ministry would be to invite a continuing reminder to the people who were immediately involved of what was a very bitter experience, and to a much wider audience of what was a terribly painful episode in the Church community. I raise these matters not to accuse you again about incidents that had a disastrous effect on your own life, but to state something that pertains very much to both your and our responsibilities to our Catholic people in this Local Church.

As the Archdiocese seeks to ascertain your real needs for the future, I believe we need to carry on our discussions within a context of understanding of what has already taken place. To date, the lawyers' fees amount to a figure in the region of \$60,000. Because of your actions, the Archdiocese was exposed to grave civil liability and has already reached settlements involving substantial sums of money with a number of people. While the details of these settlements are protected by confidentiality, the Archdiocese has been advised that our exposure to liability is not yet complete, and that there are possibly others who may come forward.

6849

Patrick Roemer

--2

At this stage, I would like to emphasize my strong conviction that you should seek employment with a view to being able to support yourself adequately and completely. Although the report from REDACTED REDACTED and Father REDACTED states that you would like to pursue a degree course, I do not wish to commit the Archdiocese to such a venture. Rather, I wish to see you devote your full attention to seeking employment. To this end, the Archdiocese would be willing, if necessary, to seek the advice of business people who are involved in the affairs of the Archdiocese.

During the period in which you are seeking employment, the Archdiocese will be willing to assist you in the amount of \$800 per month and to have you covered by the Archdiocesan health insurance. I propose such an arrangement for a six-month period, after which we would both evaluate your situation.

The report from REDACTED REDACTED and Father REDACTED also states that you are currently in debt as a result of therapy and having to borrow money from family members. To assist you, the Archdiocese will be willing to pay off this debt, which I understand is currently about \$20,000.

This payment is by way of a gift to you, and implies no other liability past, present, or future. The Archdiocese would not be in a position to assume any other bills which you might incur in future.

I hope these suggestions will be of help to you and look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

+ 

Most Reverend Roger Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles

cc: REDACTED

6850



THE ARCHDIOCESE OF SAN FRANCISCO
PASTORAL CENTER

THE TRIBUNAL

445 CHURCH STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94114-1799 (415) 565-3690

May 18, 1989

Most Reverend Roger Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015-1194

Dear Archbishop Mahony,

I am writing with regard to the petition which Reverend D. Patrick Roemer and I have placed before you concerning his support. This letter is prompted by the fact that over two months have passed since our meeting with your representatives, REDACTED EDACED and Reverend REDACTED

When I wrote Monsignor Curry last month inquiring into the status of our petition, he stated his belief that REDACTED REDACTED and Father Curry's report had been received by you and that the Archdiocese would be in touch with Father Roemer and myself soon.

While acknowledging the demands which are made on your time, I wish to stress that the continuing delay is most difficult for Father Roemer in his present circumstances; and, therefore, my purpose in writing is to request as expeditious a decision in this matter as possible.

REDACTED

cc: Reverend D. Patrick Roemer

6897



THE ARCHDIOCESE OF SAN FRANCISCO
PASTORAL CENTER

THE TRIBUNAL

445 CHURCH STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94114-1799 (415) 565-3690

May 20, 1989

Most Reverend Roger Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015-1194

Dear Archbishop Mahony,

In view of my letter of May 18, I am writing to confirm the fact that both Father Roemer and I have received your letter dated May 17, 1989.

We will be responding to your letter shortly. /
REDACTED

cc: Reverend D. Patrick Roemer

REDACTED

REDACTED

- () Please review, then SEE me
- () Please review, then RETURN to me
- () Please review, then SEND me your COMMENTS
- (X) Please review, then FILE
- () Please handle this matter entirely
- () Please answer; send copy of letter to me
- () Please write a reply for my signature
- () For your information
- () Please XEROX and send copy/copies to _____

- () original to file
- () original back to me

REMARKS:

*Interesting**Th...*

6895



THE ARCHDIOCESE OF SAN FRANCISCO
PASTORAL CENTER

THE TRIBUNAL

445 CHURCH STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94114-1799 (415) 565-3690

May 25, 1989

Most Reverend Roger Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015-1194

Dear Archbishop Mahony,

Father Roemer and I have examined the decision which you have made in the matter of the petition which we presented to you in July of 1988 regarding his maintenance and support. Both he and I feel that your letter of May 17, 1989, presents a decision which resolves many of the difficulties which Father Roemer has been experiencing.

At the outset we wish to express our appreciation for your willingness to enter seriously into a process resulting in a pastoral response to the concerns which were brought to your attention. We are sensitive to the concerns which you have raised in your letter, and it is also our wish not to create further difficulties for those whose lives have been affected by this situation.

Father Roemer is prepared to accept your decision; however, there are two points which are a matter of concern to us and which we wish to present to you in this letter in the hope that you will consider them and possibly emend the decision which you have made.

We are grateful to the Archdiocese for pledging to provide Father Roemer assistance in his search for suitable employment which will allow him to support himself adequately and completely. Since he has experienced difficulty in finding employment in the Atascadero area, the assistance of these business persons will prove most valuable.

It is of concern to us, however, whether or not it will be possible for Father Roemer to find suitable employment in the six month period of time which you present in your letter. Although he intends to undertake this pursuit seriously and actively, his present status and situation will create difficulties for him in this search.

It is our hope that the evaluation which you speak of at the end of six months will leave open the possibility of extending his support should he have been unable to find suitable

6893

Most Reverend Roger Mahony
May 25, 1989

Page 2

employment even with the assistance and advice of the persons whom you refer to.

A second concern focuses on the amount of monthly assistance which you are offering Father Roemer during this period. We acknowledge with gratitude the fact that the Archdiocese will pay the \$20,000 indebtedness which Father has incurred since 1981; however, we are concerned that the amount of \$800 which you are proposing will not be sufficient for him to meet the monthly expenses that he will encounter in the Los Angeles area and may well result in his entering into a new period of indebtedness.

It is our presumption that you have arrived at the amount of \$800 based upon the financial summaries which were provided to REDACTED REDACTED and Father REDACTED. These summaries presented the living expenses which Father Roemer has experienced while living in Atascadero. Since he will be moving to the Los Angeles area, this will have an impact on his monthly living expenses.

The cost of living in Los Angeles is significantly higher than that of Atascadero; and Father Roemer's housing and transportation expenses will increase significantly due to his move to Los Angeles. We are, therefore, concerned that the amount which you have proposed will not be sufficient for him to meet these higher living expenses.

We are asking that you consider adjusting your offer taking this move into consideration; and we would recommend that an amount of \$1500 per month would be more realistic considering the present cost of living in the Los Angeles area. In making this request, Father Roemer would be willing to keep records of his expenses for accounting purposes during the period in which the Archdiocese is assisting him.

While it was disappointing to us that you did not deem it proper to assist Father in a program of education which would make available a much wider range of employment possibilities, we again do feel that your decision is a pastoral resolution of many of the difficulties which Father Roemer has been experiencing since his remuneration was discontinued in 1981; and we do again express our gratitude for the assistance which you are offering. It is our hope that you will consider favorably the emendation which we are proposing and will include the concerns which we have presented in this letter.

Sincerely yours, in Christ,
REDACTED

cc: Reverend D. Patrick Roemer

6894

REFERRAL MEMORANDUM FROM ARCHBISHOP ROGER MAHONY

Date: 5-31-89TO: Msgr. Curry**CONFIDENTIAL**

- (X) Please review, then SEE me
() Please review, then RETURN to me
(X) Please review, then SEND me your COMMENTS
() Please review, then FILE
- () Please handle this matter entirely
() Please answer; send copy of letter to me
() Please write a reply for my signature
() For your information
- () Please XEROX and send copy/copies to: _____

- () original to file
() original back to me

REMARKS: Rogers is being made!Thank!

6892

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 20, 1989
FROM: Monsignor Curry
TO: Archbishop Mahony
RE: Rev. Patrick Roemer

CONFIDENTIAL

I discussed the attached letter with REDACTED, and we both agree that \$1500 per month would probably be a more realistic figure while Pat is getting settled in Los Angeles. I can also ask REDACTED to go ahead and contact some business people with a view to finding a position for him.

I do think we can make it clear to Pat that we will continue to evaluate the situation, but that our expectation is that he will get settled very quickly.

Please let me know if you wish me to draft a response.

Yes, please!
+ RMM

6-20-89

6891



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
 1531 WEST NINTH STREET
 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
 (213) 251-3288

Office of the Archbishop

June 21, 1989

REDACTED

The Archdiocese of San Francisco
 The Tribunal
 445 Church Street
 San Francisco, CA 94114-1799

Dear Father REDACTED

Thank you for your letter of May 25, 1989 regarding Patrick Roemer. After careful consideration, I do agree that the Archdiocese will be willing to pay Patrick \$1500 per month while he is seeking employment. As indicated in my letter to him of May 17, we see this as an arrangement of support for a six-month period, after which we would both evaluate the situation.

While I wish to assist Patrick during the time in which he is seeking employment, I also want to stress the importance of his seeking to make himself independent as soon as possible. Therefore, while we will continue to evaluate the situation, I hope he will be able to establish himself before the end of the six-month period.

As I also mentioned, the Archdiocese will be willing to assist with seeking employment, and if Patrick wishes us to make some contacts to this end, I would appreciate it if he could let us know his schedule, when he would be available, etc.

I look forward very much to seeing Patrick settled and self-supporting, wish him well in this endeavor, and anticipate hearing from you in the near future.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

+

Roger Mahony
 Most Reverend Roger Mahony
 Archbishop of Los Angeles

cc: Patrick Roemer

6890

Dona Patrick Roemer
REDACTED

Education:

M.A.T. (cand.), Masters in Applied Theology, University of California, Berkeley, (Graduate Theological Union), November, 1981.
Loyola-Marymount University, Los Angeles, (Theological upate), June, 1978-November, 1981.
B.A., Philosophy, St. John's College, Camarillo, CA., June 1966.

Experience:

12/85-present Atascadero State Hospital
P. O. Box A.
Atascadero, CA. 93423
Ward 28: Sex Offender Treatment Project: Worked as psychiatric technician (pre-licensed) providing direct therapy for clients on an individual basis. Co-clinician with psychologist for Core Treatment group employing "relapse prevention" model. Co-taught sex education courses with ward nurse and intervened with crisis counseling when needed. Directed weekly leisure skill group. Provided weekly individual sessions using relapse prevention "tools" for clients with sex and alcohol dependency problems. Also wrote weekly and monthly progress reports for ward treatment team.
* Ward 10: Program for patients "Incompetent to Stand Trial." Member of treatment team to provide basic level of care for patients. Provided individual and group sessions to restore patient's competency in court setting. Worked as teacher in basic hygiene, and supervised recreation groups on ward.

4/83-12/85 Southern California Renewal Communities
2810 Artesia Blvd.,
Redondo Beach, CA. 90278
Worked as bookstore assistant manager: Responsible for book orders, customer services, public relations, and served as liaison with local businesses. Also directed tape of the month club and wrote for company magazine.

5/31-4/83 Atascadero State Hospital
P. O. Box A,
Atascadero, CA. 93423
Professional Library: Worked as clerk and research librarian in specialized topics for hospital professional staff. Provided data filing, record keeping services, and periodical updatings.

6/78-1/81 St. Paschal's Parish
155 E. Janss Road
Thousand Oaks, CA. 91360
Associate Pastor: Worked as religious education director for adult, youth and elementary age programs.

* Addendum: My present work on this program also involves presenting an "assertive skills" class/group for clients which involves them in identifying particular needs and getting them met positively. It also functions as a basic communications group.

Provided pastoral care, as chaplain, for area regional medical center. Taught teacher-training for adults. Gave individual counseling for parish clients and provided for sacramental needs, including marriage preparation classes and marital counseling. Worked as member of retreat team for youth/family encounters.

6/74-6/78 San Roque Parish
325 Argonne Circle,
Santa Barbara, CA. 93105

Associate Pastor: Worked as county Religious Education Director, providing teacher training workshops and parent education sessions. Provided chaplain services to Juvenile Hall and county jail. Administered city inter-parish adult education program and directed theological update sessions for local pastors. Taught at elementary and high school levels, and worked as chaplain at Devereaux School for Developmentally Disabled children and youth and at Santa Barbara City College.

5/70-6/74 St. Raphael's Parish
5444 Hollister Avenue,
Santa Barbara, CA. 93111

Associate Pastor: Provided basic sacramental and pastoral services to parishioners. Taught adult education-update classes and teacher training for children. Organized summer day camp for children of one parent homes. Chaplain at St. Vincent's School for Developmentally-Disabled youth and provided retreats for teachers and students. Worked with pastoral team in parent education "in home" groups and worked as community hospital chaplain. Provided individual counseling for persons in crisis and hosted seminars.

Pat Roemer
Volunteer information/ experience.

1986-89:

AIDS Support Network, San Luis Obispo County:
Responsibility: Teacher-Trainer for volunteers in the "buddy system"
approach to client care. Pastoral Care/Spiritual Outreach chairman.

Hospice: San Luis Obispo County:
Certified grief counselor for both personal and group issues. Bereavement problems and assistance- on call for assistance as needed.

Escuela del Rio, Atascadero - dayschool for developmentally disabled adults- assistant teacher.

Casa de Vida, San Luis Obispo: - residential home for developmentally disabled adults- assistant teacher/caretaker. (Part of training as a psychiatric technician.)

MORANDUMDATE: July 7, 1989FROM: Monsignor CurryTO: REDACTEDRE: Patrick Roemer

Attached is a copy of Pat Roemer's resume. This is the priest I spoke to you about helping find a job.

I told him you would want to talk with him before contacting employers and he will be happy to meet with you.

I suspect this resume needs to be redone and please let me know if I can help.

With much appreciation of your very practical assistance as always.

MEMORANDUMJuly 7, 1989

TO: REDACTED

FROM: Monsignor Thomas Curry

RE: Patrick Roemer

First of all, let me apologize to you for not sending you some background on this case. I realize Pat called you yesterday, and you knew only what I had mentioned to you in conversation. Sorry. I hate to be put in that kind of position myself.

Pat was born in Oxnard in 1944, so he will be 45 this year. He attended St. John's Camarillo, and was ordained in 1970. He served as associate pastor in several parishes in the Santa Barbara Region and did very well. In his last parish, St. Paschal, Thousand Oaks, he was extremely popular, especially for his work with the youth.

In early 1981, however, he was arrested for child molestation. On his arrest, he indicted himself completely by giving a confession to the arresting officer. Because the administrator of the parish had been warned by a parent of Pat's behavior and had not done anything about it, the Archdiocese has settled with a number of children and their families. The settlement is secret, but there may well be other claims.

Pat was tried and sentenced to ten years in State prison. Because of the presence of a parents' group opposed to child abuse in the Thousand Oaks area, the case got great publicity.

He served a number of years and was released on parole. Since his release, he has not been able to settle into a stable job. Part of the reason was, I think, that he was hoping to be able to return to the active priesthood at some time. He also stayed in the Atascadero area working in counseling with prisoners. However, he will most likely never be able to get a state license, and this is not a fruitful line of work for him to be pursuing.

Archbishop Mahony has made it clear to him that he can never again serve as a priest here and that we could not recommend him to another diocese. We are helping him to make a transition in his life and are encouraging him strongly to seek laicization. He has asked if the Archdiocese would send him back to school to be trained for another profession, and the Archdiocese is not willing to do this.

We have received very good accounts from the therapist he is attending, and I have reason to believe he has made very significant


progress in his life. However, because this disease is so deep rooted, we do not know that a person is ever cured.

Pat is a very talented person. He should be good in sales or management. Obviously we would not recommend him for a job that involved working with minors.

I do hope this background will be helpful, and please let me know if I can give you any more information.

Many thanks for all your help.

COPY



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
(213) 251-3200

OFFICE OF VICAR FOR CLERGY
(213) 251-3284

July 12, 1989

Patrick Roemer
REDACTED

Dear Pat:

Enclosed is the first check for \$1500. Remaining checks will be sent directly to you on the first of each month beginning August 1.

In reviewing the files, I do not find a recent letter to you and just do not remember what I was referring to in our phone conversation. However, I have been in contact with REDACTED and he told me he is aware of you and is planning to contact you soon.

You will be covered under the Archdiocesan Health Plan effective July 14, 1989, and I am in process of requesting a check to cover your debts, as mentioned in the Archbishop's letter of May 17.

I hope this will answer your questions for the moment. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any further questions, however.

Sincerely yours,

(Rev. Msgr.) Thomas J. Curry
Vicar for Clergy

Enclosure

6874

July 13, 1989.
REDACTED

Rev. Msgr. Thomas Curry
Vicar for the Clergy
1530 West Ninth St.
Los Angeles, Ca. 90015-1194

Dear Monsignor Curry;

I would like to acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 12, 1989. I am grateful that I received the check for \$1500.00, and understand that remaining checks will be sent directly to me on the first of each month beginning August 1st.

I realize that you also have been in contact with REDACTED and that he will contact me soon. I appreciate this since I need to drive down in the Los Angeles-Orange County area to look for suitable places to rent as soon as possible.

REDACTED

REDACTED and that you are in process of requesting a check to cover my debts.

Thanks very much for all your assistance, and I will be in contact with you again if I have any further questions.

Sincerely Yours,



Pat Roemer

6873



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
(213) 251-3288

Office of the Archbishop

CONFIDENTIAL

July 17, 1989

REDACTED

The Tribunal
Archdiocese of San Francisco
445 Church Street
San Francisco, CA 94114


Dear REDACTED

I wish to acknowledge your letter of June 30, 1989 in which you accept the final decision and plans which I have offered in the case of D. Patrick Roemer.

However, unless you possess power of attorney for D. Patrick Roemer, I must ask that Patrick send me a letter of his own composition and with his signature in which he accepts the details of our plan and final decision. This is necessary for both canonical and civil requirements.

Thanking you for your assistance in this matter, and looking forward to its final and happy conclusion, I am

Sincerely yours in Christ,

+ 
Most Reverend Roger Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles

cc: D. Patrick Roemer
Monsignor Thomas Curry

REDACTED

6871

July 23, 1989

Dear

REDACTED

I hope that all goes well for you and your work.

I signed the papers sent to me by REDACTED, Currip's secretary, Marge.

I had a questionnaire: that section asking if I am a present day employee - I called REDACTED & she said to check off "present" but write in "Inactive leave."

I did so - this is my present status. also, as soon as I get my phone # & new job, I'll call and tell you. I move to Garden Grove on Monday, (approx.) July 31st. The correct zip code is 92640 - in case you cannot read it on the page. I appreciate your assistance.

Gratefully,

Pat Roemer
- until 8-1-89

REDACTED

6870

file
REDACTED

July 24, 1989.

Most Reverend Roger Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, Ca. 90015-1194

Dear Archbishop Mahony:

I am very grateful for your letters of both June 21 and May 17 in which you detail your plan of assistance to me and your final decision.

I accept your plan and decisions which include the payment of \$1500.00 per month until I find a job, and the payment of my debts in the amount of \$20,000.00.

The above-mentioned letters also spoke of the Archdiocese being willing to assist me with seeking employment. I have already followed through with this, and am meeting with REDACTED towards this particular end.

Again, - I thank you for your assistance in the area of my "getting on with my life." May all be well with you in all your work.

Sincerely and Gratefully,



D. Patrick Roemer

D. Patrick Roemer

6867

CONFIDENTIAL

ROSE RYAN ARCHBISHOP
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, Ca. 90015-1194



6868

D. Strick Roemer

Thurs. July 27

REDACTED

Dear Tom,

I received the
\$20,000.00 check today!
I appreciate your help,
and that of ^{REDACTED} your
secretary.

I move down to H. G.
this Sunday - I feel very
positive and excited
about this new major
transition. I had a good
meeting ^{REDACTED} last
Sunday, and will very
soon be in contact again
as I am "settled." He is a
very kind and helpful

6863

person! I found a nice,
small, but adequate apt.
after 32 tries!! It's
close to both L.A. and most
parts of Orange County. I am
now working in my probation
office to transfer probation
to Orange so when I have to
attend monthly meetings, I'll
be much closer than Ventura
County, it does seem to be
all working out "nicely".

I am much grateful for
your efforts, and Archbishop
McDonnell's, of course! Please be
assured of my grateful remem-
brance at prayer and in my
positive thought as I begin
another phase of my life.

Sincerely,
Pat Roemer

Send copy
for REDACTED

Original to C file
underline ref lines
& put a note on for
REDACTED w REDACTED

6865

BISHOP ROGER MCHONY

REDACTED REDACTED

Date:

7-29-89

TO:

RECEIVED JUL 31 1989

- ☐ Please review, then SEE me
☐ Please review, then RETURN to me
☒ Please review, then SEND me your COMMENTS
☒ Please review, then FILE

- ☐ Please handle this matter entirely
☐ Please answer; send copy of letter to me
☐ Please write a reply for my signature
☐ For your information

- ☐ Please XEROX and send copy/copies to:

- ☐ original to file
☐ original back to me

REMARKS:

*I don't like the expression "until I feel
 a job." Didn't we agree to be more
 than*

6866

0077

REDACTED

October 16, 1989.

REDACTED
REDACTED

Archdiocese of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, Ca. 90015

Dear Mr. REDACTED

This letter is to report that I have found a position with the United Cambodian Community, Inc., with offices both here in Garden Grove and also in Santa Ana. I was recently hired as their "Basic English Skills Testing Specialist." I give basic English tests to refugees and immigrants coming through Orange County. This position is part of a grant, and the particular funding is completed this November, so I do hope that it is re-funded so this position continues. I find it very interesting since my work is a social service, and this field is what I am studying at Cal State, Long Beach in the evening. My salary is nearly \$1500 per month, so my take home will be around \$1300 which is very basically meeting my needs.

I also would ask that, if possible, I could be compensated for one more month, i.e. receive a check on November 1. I know that this would greatly assist me since payment for our spring semester is due, book payments are due and I am new in my position at work.

I appreciate the assistance I have received from the Archdiocese through the help of Archbishop Mahony and yourself.

Very sincerely and gratefully,

D. Patrick Roemer

RECEIVED

OCT 17 1989

REDACTED

6856

MEMORANDUMOctober 26, 1989

TO: Archbishop Mahony
FROM: Monsignor Thomas Curry
RE: Pat Roemer

Attached is a copy of a recent letter from Pat Roemer. I have asked that he receive a stipend for the month of November and certainly hope he will be able to support himself from now on.

*Looks fine - I am hopeful
that he will make this transition
on his own.*

+ Rmk

10-28-89

6855

CCI 003270

MEMORANDUMOctober 26, 1989

TO: Monsignor REDACTED
FROM: Monsignor Thomas Curry
RE: Pat Roemer

CONFIDENTIAL

Attached for you information is a recent letter from Pat. I certainly hope he will be able to be independent from now on.

6858

REDACTED

December 18, 1989.

The Most Reverend Roger Mahony,
Archbishop of Los Angeles,
1531 West Ninth Street,
Los Angeles, California 90015

Dear Archbishop Mahony:

This letter is to both wish you all the blessings of this special season, and to let you know that I have found a position as of last month.

I work as an English test specialist for the United Cambodian Community in Orange county; they are the central intake unit for all refugees coming into this area.

I would like to thank you for the financial assistance you have given to me since I moved here in August. It has been of great benefit to me!


May all that you do be blessed.

Sincerely and Gratefully,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Patrick Roemer". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Patrick Roemer

REDACTED



Most Rev. Roger Kenworthy
Chancery Office
1531 W. North St.
Los Angeles, Ca 90015

Personal

6844

STOR. HOUSE. PARONY

Date: 12-22-89

REDACTED REDACTED

TO: _____

- () Please review, then SEE me
() Please review, then RETURN to me
() Please review, then SEND me your COMMENTS
(X) Please review, then FILE

- () Please handle this matter entirely
() Please answer; send copy of letter to me
() Please write a reply for my signature
() For your information

- () Please XEROX and send copy/copies to: _____

- () original to file
() original back to me

REMARKS: _____

Thanks!

6842

Dear Mr. Roemer -
If this strikes you
as weird, please
do not hesitate to
call me & I will
explain.

REDACTED

Office of the
Clery

REDACTED

6834

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES,
A CORPORATION SOLE

REDACTED

LOS ANGELES, CA 90074-2242

6833



COPY

MEMORANDUM

9/25/92

FROM: REDACTED

TO:

RE: REV. DONALD P. ROEMER (PATRICK ROEMER)

REDACTED

REDACTED

I have a DO NOT GIVE
OUT address and you can send it over to us to try mailing it
there.

6832

MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 26, 1994

FROM: REDACTED

TO:

RE: Rev. Donald P. Roemer

Yesterday afternoon we received a call from a REDACTED (REDACTED) REDACTED inquiring about a Fr. Romer, AKA "The Great Pumpkin" who was at St. Raphael Church, Santa Barbara about 20 years ago -- when REDACTED said he was of grammar school age.

REDACTED that he had knowledge of the fact that Fr. Roemer had been in treatment at Atascadero Mental facility. He also said it was URGENT that he locate him.

When I pulled the card and saw the notation "Sick Leave" -- I decided to hold off and told him we would return the call today.

REDACTED

and he needed info in the Am. and left message a tape 1/26

6830



FYI

Archdiocese of Los Angeles

Office of the
Vicar for Canonical Services
(213) 637-7888

3424
Wilshire
Boulevard

Los Angeles
California
90010-2241

February 2, 1999

Mr. Patrick Roemer
REDACTED

Dear Patrick,

I hope that this letter will find you in good health and spirits. Though somewhat belatedly, I pray that this year will be a blessed and happy one for you.

I am writing to you at the instance of Cardinal Mahony and in my capacity as *Episcopal Vicar for Canonical Services*. As part of the responsibilities of this new position, I work to seek a pastoral and canonical resolution of the status of those priests of the Archdiocese that, for various reasons, have taken an "inactive leave" from priestly ministry.

His Eminence has asked me to contact you so that I might encourage and assist you to prepare a petition for a *Dispensation from the Obligations of Priesthood* to the Holy See. This seems appropriate, in view of the many years that you have been away from ministry, the successful adjustment that you have made to secular life, the state of your health, and the special circumstances that realistically would make it impossible for you to ever effectively engage in priestly ministry.

Initially, all I wish to do is to meet with you, hear what has been happening in your life, and discuss your openness to this proposal. On the basis of our informal conversation, I would hope that we could then amicably work together to resolve your present canonical status.

Consequently, I would really appreciate it if you would call me within the next few days so that we can arrange to get together by no later than **March 3, 1999**. We could meet either at my office or at another location where you might feel more comfortable. At that time, we could also discuss any other question you might have. Please call me at the office to arrange an appointment at REDACTED Or, if you prefer, you can leave a message for me on my machine at home at REDACTED

I know that this is a difficult and perhaps even painful decision for you to make. I wish you to know that I will be willing to assist you in any way I can. Until we meet, you can be assured of my prayers, please remember me in yours.

Fraternally yours in Christ,

Rev. Modesto Lewis Pérez, J.D., J.C.D.
Vicar for Canonical Services/Vice Chancellor

6829

Notes from phone conversation with REDACTED **on July 14, 1999.** REDACTED

REDACTED called the VFC asking for information regarding the time and length of assignment of Fr. Donald Patrick Roemar at St. Pascal Church. Dr. REDACTED provided her with general information because Father Roemar's file was not available.

REDACTED called back asking for specific dates. Dr. REDACTED then inquired as to her interest in this information. She informed him that her stepson is claiming that Fr. Roemar molested him while he was at St. Pascal's. She was inquiring about dates because she was not sure that she believed him. She reported that he has many problems, including REDACTED. He currently is blaming all of his current and past difficulties on his accusation of molestation.

REDACTED stated that this has never been reported to anyone in the church and she had just found out about this last year. Dr. REDACTED informed her that he would call her back with the information that she requested within one week. Dr. REDACTED also informed her that the archdiocese is willing to hear a complaint from her stepson if he wanted to do so.

REDACTED

April 4, 2002

His Eminence , Cardinal Roger M. Mahony
Archdiocese of Los Angeles
3424 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90010-2241

Dear Cardinal Mahony,

I was born in Santa Barbara in 1968. My family attended St. Raphael's Church and it was at that Parish that my family came to know Fr. Patrick Roemer. In approximately 1975 my family moved to Thousand Oaks and became parishioners at St. Paschal's. Fr. Roemer was transferred from St. Raphael's to St. Paschal's where our friendship continued. I attended St. Paschal's School and was an altar boy.

I spent numerous nights with Fr. Roemer. The occasion I remember most was a trip to a ranch house where we spent the night. We shared a sleeping bag where we touched each other and he kissed me. At that age I was too confused and scared to come forth. He was a Priest whom I had been taught to respect and additionally a friend of my family.

The night Fr. Roemer was arrested he had had dinner with my family and my mother was to take me to the rectory later that night to spend the night with him. I know he was sent to Atascadero State Hospital and I hope his priesthood was taken away. He had molested numerous boys who, like me, trusted and respected him.

I now live here in REDACTED my mother lives here also. I have REDACTED sons and I work 50 to 60 hours a week to provide for them. I coach soccer for my boys. My father REDACTED REDACTED This tragedy in my life has tormented me for approximately 20 years and I have not been able to talk about it. My boys have not been baptized. My mother has taken them to church with her at Our Lady and they express interest in attending church. I too want to again be a part of the Catholic Church and I have recently tried to return and take them with me. That attempt has made all this childhood horror come flooding back and I have been able to talk with my mother about it to some extent for the first time.

This childhood abuse has caused me emotional pain for most of my life. It has tormented me for all these years. I blame the Archdiocese of Los Angeles for moving Fr. Roemer from Santa Barbara to Thousand Oaks because of accusations at St. Paschal's. That was the time for the cycle to be broken and many boys to be protected by the intervention of the Archdiocese. I hold the Church accountable for this damage to me and to many other boys. I need to find the professional help to put this part of my life behind me and I ask that the Archdiocese pay for the help that I need. I have no way to afford this help. I

need it solved for my own peace and so that my family and I can return to the Church. I have not spoken with an attorney and have no intention of doing so; I only wish to be rid of my own hurt.

I would appreciate your response by 30 April. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely yours,

REDACTED

Clergy Misconduct

Suspected Child Abuse Report

Victim: REDACTED Son Case: REDACTED / Roemer
 Past Parishioner St. Paschal
 Thousand Oaks, Ca

Initial report: Call on 4/23/02 4:00 p.m. REDACTED
 Given REDACTED name & number did not want to use it.

Victim: 10 year old boy – molested 3 times

Place: St. Paschal Baylon Parish

REDACTED reported that her 10 years old son was molested by Fr. Roemer in 1980's. He was molested by Fr. Patrick Roemer. He was molested three times. At 13 years old he was obsessed with karate and at 15 years old he was REDACTED and wouldn't speak. In the 1990's he was a violent offender and had REDACTED

REDACTED's son has been upset by the news media's reporting of the sexual abuse issues. He told his Mother that worse than the abuse was "what Father said during the abuse". The boy did not want his Mother to tell anyone about the abuse. REDACTED's son has not told her specifically about the abuse or what Father said.

REDACTED disclosed that she and her husband divorced around the above time and she moved away.

REDACTED's son is REDACTED He had intensive therapy for anger management. He has been better over the past five years. He's in contact with a therapist at UCLA.



COPY

Archdiocese of Los Angeles

Office of
Vicar for Clergy
(213) 637-7284

3424
Wilshire
Boulevard

Los Angeles
California
90010-2241

May 8, 2002

REDACTED

Dear REDACTED

I am profoundly sorry for the abusive treatment and betrayal of trust that was inflicted upon you by Father Patrick Roemer. A priest has a trusted position and any form of deception and abuse is intolerable. As you know, Father Roemer is no longer in ministry.

Let me apologize for not responding by April 30 as you requested. With the Cardinal's recent hospitalization, we have not been able to be as responsive as you and some others deserve.


I realize that no words can remove the anger you have. You have given voice to your abusive experience. You have broken the silence. I pray that this very fact may contribute to your spiritual and emotional healing.

The Cardinal received your letter before going to Rome for meetings with the Pope and the American Cardinals regarding sexual misconduct by priests. He has reflected then and now on the content of your letter and will incorporate this knowledge in future policy and action steps.

Please call Sister REDACTED, our REDACTED at REDACTED. She will make an appointment to talk with you and will work with you to assure that you receive the professional therapy that will help you deal with that deep hurt of which your letter so powerfully speaks.

Please accept my humble and heartfelt apology in the form of these few words. I pray that the Holy Spirit's healing power will fill and strengthen you.

Sincerely yours in Christ,



Monsignor Craig A. Cox, J.C.D.
Vicar for Clergy

cc: Sister REDACTED

6822

REDACTED

REDACTED

May 19, 2002

Monsignor Craig A. Cox, J.C.D.
 Vicar for Clergy
 Archdiocese of Los Angeles
 Office of the Archbishop
 3424 Wilshire Boulevard
 Los Angeles, California 90010-2241

Dear Monsignor Cox:

I have received your letter of 8 May and am grateful for your concern and sympathy. My anger is building daily; it is like allowing a genie out of the bottle. I feel as though I am going to explode and, as I expressed earlier, I badly need help in putting this problem to rest. I have consulted with an attorney who believes that I am entitled to damages although I don't know if I could go through a trial. I am ashamed of the things that were done to me and don't want to proclaim them to the world. The attorney further believes, as I do, that getting psychiatric help is the first step. As you say, having broken my silence, hopefully healing is possible and I have to believe deep inside that the Church will do the right and moral thing.

I explained in my earlier letter that I work 50 to 60 hours a week and there is no possible way that I could meet with Sister REDACTED or receive counseling in Los Angeles. Further I would not feel comfortable discussing my response to this problem with a woman. I believe that I should be able to obtain the professional help that is right for me.

We have a psychiatrist here in REDACTED, Dr. REDACTED, who is an active, committed Catholic and who also has a son, and three daughters, of his own. Further he is a fine and capable doctor. I specifically wish for the Archdiocese of Los Angeles to pay him to give me the help I need. On your assurance, I am sure that I could have Dr. REDACTED bill you directly. REDACTED

Our local Priest, Father REDACTED, would give me any spiritual help that I need but I do not believe that he is sufficiently trained to help me with my anger and hurt. He has expressed his concern for me. REDACTED REDACTED

I hope that the Cardinal is recovering.

Sincerely yours,

REDACTED

150 initial visit
 \$110 - per session

RECEIVED
MAY 22 2002
BY: _____

6821

HOUSE OF AFFIRMATION, INC.

International Therapeutic Center for Clergy and Religious

20 May 1981

REDACTED

His Eminence Timothy Cardinal Manning, D.D., J.C.D.
1531 W. 9th Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

RE: Reverend Patrick Roemer

Your Eminence:

This letter comes to you in reference to Reverend Patrick Roemer who came to the House of Affirmation, Montara, California for psychotheological assessment on May 3 to May 6, 1981.

REDACTED

The evaluation consisted of a series of clinical interviews and a number of tests for neuropsychological screening and personality appraisal.

REDACTED

A psychological interview was conducted by REDACTED and
a psychiatric interview was conducted by REDACTED
REDACTED

Psychological testing was administered by REDACTED and REDACTED
REDACTED and a final interview was conducted by Rev. Bernard J. Bush, S.J.

5829

1185 Acacia Street • Box 437 • Montara, California 94037 • 415/728-3361

DECLASSIFIED
1981

His Eminence Timothy Cardinal Manning, D.D., J.C.D.
RE: Rev. Patrick Roemer
20 May 1981
Page 2

PERSONAL AND FAMILY HISTORY

REDACTED

REDACTED

I

His Eminence Timothy Cardinal Manning, D.D., J.C.D.
20 May 1981
Page 6

RE: Reverend Patrick Roemer

REDACTED

Thank you, REDACTED, for your support of
Father Roemer's attempts to obtain the assistance needed
to facilitate growth and change.

Sincerely,
REDACTED

Psychotherapist/

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Rev. Bernard J. Bush, S.J.".

Rev. Bernard J. Bush, S.J.
Regional Director

REDACTED

cc: Reverend Patrick Roemer

5834

REFERRAL AND REPORT

REDACTED

Clinic or Service Psychological (or) Person _____

Reason for Referral: Psychological evaluation.

Signature: _____ Date: _____ Unit: 4

Date Dictated: August 9, 1982
Date Typed: August 9, 1982

REPORT

W Donald Patrick Roemer is a 38-year-old (D.O.B. 3-17-44), Caucasian who was admitted to Atascadero State Hospital on 6-3-81 for male pedophilia.

REDACTED

PROBLEM NO. PAGE 1 TITLE _____ ☐ Continued

REFERRAL AND REPORT

<input type="checkbox"/> CONSULTATION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EVALUATION	<input type="checkbox"/> SERVICE
<input type="checkbox"/> Audiometric	<input type="checkbox"/> Medical	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Psychological
<input type="checkbox"/> Dental	<input type="checkbox"/> Physical Therapy	<input type="checkbox"/> Rehabilitation
<input type="checkbox"/> Developmental	<input type="checkbox"/> Podiatry	<input type="checkbox"/> Social
<input type="checkbox"/> Education	<input type="checkbox"/> Psychiatric	<input type="checkbox"/> Speech
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____		

AT 03 20 39 -0
Atascadero State Hospital

Confidential Client/Patient Information
See W & I Code 5328

5715

Santa Clara Church

June 17, 2006.


Dea REDACTED

This is to inform you that the information/laicization regarding Fr. Pat Roemer has been duly entered into our records (Baptismal book, 1944, # 26-12), as requested. Thank you for all of your work and if you have any additional questions or concerns please do not hesitate to contact me at the attached address and number.

Sincerely,
REDACTED

409782

323 South E Street • Oxnard, Ca. 93030 • (805) 487-3891 • Fax (805) 487-4733



CONGREGATIO
PRO DOCTRINA FIDEI

00120 Città del Vaticano,
Palazzo del S. Ufficio

3 April 2006

PROT. N. 884/2004 - 22372

(In responsione fiat mentio huius numeri)

CONFIDENTIAL

Your Eminence,

On 16 November 2004 you presented and supported the petition, dated 10 November 2004, of the **Rev. Donald Patrick ROEMER**, a priest of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles who has admitted acts of sexual abuse against minors and has requested from the Holy Father the grace of dispensation from all the obligations of the clerical state, including celibacy.

This Congregation, after having carefully examined the documents of the present case and in light of the *votum* expressed by Your Excellency, decided on 10 December 2005 to forward the petition to the Holy Father for his decision. Subsequently, on 17 March 2006, Pope Benedict XVI granted the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer the grace of dispensation *iuxta petita*, from all priestly obligations, including celibacy. Enclosed you will find two copies of the relevant Decree. Your Excellency is kindly requested to ensure that the priest is duly notified thereof. I would ask you also to return one of the signed copies of the Decree to this Office.

With prayerful support and every best wish, I remain

Yours fraternally in the Lord,

William Card. Levada

William Card. LEVADA
Prefect

-Enclosures-

His Eminence
Roger Cardinal MAHONY
Archbishop of Los Angeles
3424 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90010-2202
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

409783



CONGREGATIO PRO DOCTRINA FIDEI

Prot. N. 165/2003

Angelorum in California
(Los Angeles, U.S.A.)

D.nus **Donald Patrick ROEMER**, presbyter huius arcidioecesis, humiliter petit dispensationem ab omnibus oneribus sacrae Ordinationi conexis

Summus Pontifex Benedictus, Papa XVI

Die 17 m. Martii a. 2006

habita relatione de casu a Congregatione pro Doctrina Fidei,
precibus praedicti sacerdotis annuit iuxta sequentes rationes:

1. Dispensationis Rescriptum a competenti Ordinario oratori quamprimum notificandum est:

- a) Eius effectum sortitur a momento notificationis;
- b) Rescriptum amplectitur inseparabiliter dispensationem a sacro coelibatu et simul amissionem status clericalis. Nunquam oratori fas est duo illa elementa seiungere, seu prius accipere et alterum recusare;
- c) Si vero orator est religiosus, Rescriptum concedit etiam dispensationem a votis;
- d) Idemque insuper secumfert, quatenus opus sit, absolutionem a censuris.

2. Notificatio dispensationis fieri potest vel personaliter ab ipso Ordinario eiusve delegato aut per ecclesiasticum actuarium vel per "epistulas praescriptas" (*registered*). Ordinarius unum exemplar restituere debet rite ab oratore subsignatum ad fidem receptionis Rescripti dispensationis ac simul acceptationis eiusdem praeceptorum.

3. Notitia concessae dispensationis adnotetur in Libris baptizatorum parociae oratoris.

4. Quod attinet, si casus ferat, ad celebrationem canonici matrimonii, applicandae sunt normae quae in Codice Iuris Canonici statuuntur. Ordinarius vero curet ut res caute peragantur sine exteriore apparatu.

5. Auctoritas ecclesiastica, cui spectat Rescriptum oratori rite notificare, hunc enixe hortetur, ut vitam Populi Dei, ratione congruendi cum nova eius vivendi condicione, participet, aedificationem praestet et ita probum Ecclesiae filium se exhibeat. Simul autem eidem notum faciat ea quae sequuntur.

- a) *Sacerdos dispensatus eo ipso amittit iura statui clericali propria, dignitates et officia ecclesiastica; ceteris obligationibus cum statu clericali conexas non amplius adstringitur;*
- b) *exclusus manet ab exercitio sacri ministerii, iis exceptis de quibus in can. 976 et 986 § 2 CJC ac propterea nequit homiliam habere, nec potest officium gerere directivum in ambitu pastoralis neve munere administratoris paroecialis fungi;*
- c) *item nullum munus absolvere potest in Seminariis et in Institutis aequiparatis. In aliis Institutis studiorum gradus superioris, quae quocumque modo dependent ab Auctoritate ecclesiastica, munere directivo fungi nequit;*
- d) *in aliis vero Institutis studiorum gradus superioris ab Auctoritate ecclesiastica non dependentibus nullam theologicam disciplinam tradere potest;*
- e) *in Institutis autem studiorum gradus inferioris dependentibus ab Auctoritate ecclesiastica, munere directivo vel officio docendi fungi nequit. Eadem lege tenetur presbyter dimissus ac dispensatus in tradendo Religione in Institutis eiusdem generis non dependentibus ab Auctoritate ecclesiastica.*

6. Ordinarius curet ne presbyter dispensatus, propter defectum debitae prudentiae, fidelibus scandalum praebeat. Haec pastoralis sollicitudo Ordinarium a fortiori gravissime urget si adest periculum quamvis remotum minoribus abutendi.

7. Tempore autem opportuno, Ordinarius competens breviter ad Congregationem de peracta notificatione referat, et si qua tandem fidelium admiratio adsit, prudenti explicatione provideat.

Contrariis quibuscumque minime obstantibus.

Ex Aedibus Congregationis, die 17 m. Martii a. 2006

William Cord. Levada

✠ Gulielmus Iosephus LEVADA
Archiep. emeritus S. Francisci in California
Praefectus

x. A. Amato

✠ Angelus AMATO, S.D.B.
Archiep. titularis Silensis
a Secretis

Dies notificationis _____

Subsignatio Presbyteri in signum
acceptionis

Subsignatio Ordinarii

409785



APOSTOLIC NUNCIATURE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

3339 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008-3687

18902

November 19, 2004

No.

This No. Should Be Prefixed to the Answer

Dear Monsignor Cox:

I acknowledge your kind letter of November 17, 2004,
with enclosures.

Rest assured that the correspondence concerning
Reverend Donald Patrick Roemer, including a check in amount
\$500.00 for the taxa, will be duly forwarded through the
diplomatic pouch to His Eminence, Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger,
Prefect, Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

With cordial regards and best wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Archbishop Gabriel Montalvo
Apostolic Nuncio

Monsignor Craig A. Cox, J.C.D.
Vicar for Clergy
Archdiocese of Los Angeles
3424 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90010-2241

409786

CCI 005286

11-10-04

Dear Craig,

I'm sorry this letter is late in coming - when you phoned, I was still unpacking from a move to a new apt. complex. I still cannot get my computer operational, so I had to hand-write the letter, - so unprofessional, I know!

I cannot use our work computer since it's in a very conspicuous place - no privacy. Plus we aren't allowed to use it for personal things.

Thanks for your phone conversation - I wish you well!

Sincerely,

Pat Roemer

REDACTED

NOV 15 2004

**FILE**

Archdiocese of Los AngelesOffice of
Vicar for Clergy
(213) 637-72843424
Wilshire
BoulevardLos Angeles
California
90010-2202

November 22, 2004

Patrick Roemer
1700 N. Community Drive
Anaheim, CA 92806


Dear Pat:

Thank you so much for writing. This is to acknowledge that I received your letter of November 10, 2004, petitioning our Holy Father for a dispensation from the obligations of the clerical state.

We forwarded that petition to on November 16. I will keep you informed of developments.

May God bless you!

Yours in Christ,



Monsignor Craig A. Cox
Vicar for Clergy

409788



FILE

Archdiocese of Los Angeles

Office of
Vicar for Clergy
(213) 637-7284

3424
Wilshire
Boulevard

Los Angeles
California
90010-2202

November 17, 2004

Archbishop Gabriel Montalvo, J.C.D.
Apostolic Nunciature
3339 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20008

RE: Reverend Donald Patrick Roemer
CDF Prot. No. 165/03

Your Excellency:

Enclosed, please find a letter from Cardinal Roger M. Mahony to Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger at the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith, regarding Reverend Donald Patrick Roemer, who has petitioned for a dispensation from clerical obligations and a return to the lay state. All materials are submitted in triplicate.


Since Father Roemer has been convicted of *gaviera delicta* by the civil authorities, this petition is directed to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

Would you please be so kind as to forward this to the Congregation on our behalf?

Enclosed with these materials is a check made out to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith for \$500.00, the *taxa* in such matters.

Thank you very much for your kind attention to this matter. May God continue to bless you!

Yours in Christ,


Monsignor Craig A. Cox, J.C.D.
Vicar for Clergy

enclosures

409789

176241

Check Date: 16.Nov.2004

ACCLA

Check No.

Invoice Number	Invoice Date	Voucher ID	Gross Amount	Discount Available	Paid Amount
512 VC	15.Nov.2004	00118806	500.00	0.00	500.00

Vendor Number	Name		Total Discounts		
0000002838	Congregation For The Doctrine		\$0.00		
Check Number	Date		Total Amount	Discounts Taken	Total Paid Amount
	16.Nov.2004		\$500.00	\$0.00	\$500.00

DO NOT CASH IF THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT HAVE A LARGE FAINT IMAGE OF THE "SECURE DOCUMENT" LOGO OVER A FADING PATTERN OF THE WORDS "SECURE DOCUMENT"



The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles
 (A Corporation Sole)
 3424 Wilshire Blvd.
 Los Angeles, California 90010-2241
 (213) 637-7691

Wachovia Bank, N.A.
 Greenville, South Carolina
 In Cooperation with & Payable If Desired at
 Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.
 4759-613201 67-1/532

176241

Date
 November 16, 2004

Pay Amount
 \$ 500.00***

Pay ****FIVE HUNDRED AND XX / 100 US-DOLLAR****

REDACTED

To The
 Order Of

CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE
 of the Faith
 Piazza Del S Offizio II
 00120 Vatican City

REDACTED

Authoriz

409790



Archdiocese of Los Angeles

Office of
the Archbishop
(213) 637-7288

3424
Wilshire
Boulevard

Los Angeles
California
90010-2202

November 16, 2004

His Eminence
Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger
Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith
Piazza del S. Uffizio, 11
00120 Vatican City State
Europe

Re: Reverend Donald Patrick Roemer
Petition of Father Roemer for a Return to the Lay State
Prot. No: 165/03

Your Eminence:

Enclosed, please find a petition for a dispensation from the obligations of the clerical state and a return to the lay state submitted by Reverend Donald Patrick Roemer.


As you recall, I had previously written to you on March 21, 2003, requesting the imposition of the penalty of dismissal from the clerical state on Father Roemer. I provided selected documentation regarding the fact that Father Roemer confessed to sexual abuse of minors, and was convicted and imprisoned on those charges.

In view of his petition and for the good of the Church, I hereby recommend that His Holiness accept this petition as soon as possible and that a rescript of dispensation from clerical obligations and return to the lay state be issued in an expeditious manner.

I am also enclosing the completed cover sheet requested by the Congregation in matters involving *graviora delicta*.

Thank you for your attention to this difficult matter. Please be assured of my prayers.

Sincerely yours in Christ.


Cardinal Roger M. Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles

enclosures

409791

Donald Patrick Roemer
REDACTED

Nov. 10, 2004

To: His Holiness,
Pope John Paul II
Vatican City

Your Holiness:

I, Reverend Donald Patrick Roemer, hereby ask for a dispensation from the obligations of the sacred order of the Priesthood and the related obligations of the clerical state.

I present this petition due to my inability to return to any effective priestly ministry. I hereby present this petition to return to the lay state for the welfare of the Church and my own peace of mind and soul.

Very Sincerely,
Donald Patrick Roemer

DIOCESE	Los Angeles in California
NAME OF ORDINARY	Cardinal Roger M. Mahony
CDF PROT. N. (if available)	165/03
NAME OF CLERIC	Reverend Donald Patrick Roemer

PERSONAL DETAILS OF THE CLERIC	Date of Birth	17 March 1944	Age	60
	Ordination	23 May 1970	Years of ministry	11
ORIGINAL DIOCESE OF INCARDINATION		Los Angeles in California		
MINISTRY IN/TRANSFER TO OTHER DIOCESE		REDACTED		
CONTACT ADDRESS OF THE CLERIC				
PROCURATOR (include original signed mandate)				
CONTACT ADDRESS OF THE PROCURATOR				
ASSIGNMENTS				
Year	Parish	Location	Appointment	
1970-1974	St. Raphael	Goleta, California	Parochial Vicar	
1974-1978	San Roque	Santa Barbara, California	Parochial Vicar	
1975-1977	Santa Barbara Juvenile Hall	Santa Barbara, California	Chaplain	
1977-1978	Los Prietos Boys Camp	Santa Barbara, California	Chaplain	
1978-1981	St. Paschal Baylon	Thousand Oaks, California	Parochial Vicar	
1981			Sick Leave	
1989			Inactive Leave	
ACCUSATIONS AGAINST THE CLERIC				
Year	Victim	Age	Imputable Acts	Denunciation
1969	REDACTED	10	Fondling of the boy underneath his clothes, and had the boy put his penis in the priest's mouth	2002

REDACTED

1981	8	Sat the boy on his lap, and rubbed his stomach, chest and nipples underneath his shirt while the priest was "shivering." He also placed his hands on the boy's leg close to his "privates" though did not touch the boy's genitals. Father Roemer specifically confessed to abuse of this boy.	1981
1980	14	Rubbed the boy's bare back. On a vacation, slept in bed with the boy, initially rubbing his chest, underarm and stomach, then began to rub the boy's groin area.	1981
1962	9	Donald Patrick Roemer was a seminarian at this time. The complainant, however, did not understand that he was not yet a priest. Attempts to have the minor orally copulate the priest, 4 to 10 occasions over a period of three years.	2003
1980	6	Reached into the boy's pajamas and fondled his penis during a church retreat camp. One occasion.	1981
1980	11	Pat the child's buttocks, rub his chest and nipples under the boy's clothing, fondled genitals over clothing, sodomized the child, many many times over a one year period.	2003
1981	12	Sat behind the boy, rubbed underneath the boy's shirt, rubbing of chest and stomach and under the boy's arms, while the priest was "shaking." This occurred on three occasions. Father Roemer specifically confessed to abusing this boy.	1981
1980	11	Put hand inside the boy's shirt and rubbed his stomach while the priest "trembled all over."	1991
1980	10	The mother of REDACTED reported that her son was molested. The man himself never came forward.	2002
1979	8	Putting his hand up the child's short and kissing him on the face and neck. Putting his hand down the boy's sweatpants and stroking his penis, digital penetration of the boy's anus.	2003
1981	7	Rubbing of minor's stomach followed by slipping his hand under minor's underpants and rubbing his genitals. Father Romer specifically confessed to stroking the boy's penis.	1981
1981	10	Rubbing under the shirt off stomach, chest, under the arms, kissing of the ear of the minor during the Sacrament of Penance	1981
1979	9	Oral copulation and anal intercourse. Approximately ten instances over a period of three to five months.	2003

REDACTED

1980	12	Hugging and holding the boy in a sexual manner that made the boy feel very uncomfortable.	1981
1980	12	Spent nights together numerous times, including one time sharing the same sleeping bag. On these occasions there was fondling and kissing.	2002
1980	10	Kissing on the neck, untucking shirt and rubbing chest, stomach back, forcing the child to sit in his lap for extended periods of time, sporadically over the period of an academic year.	2003

CIVIL PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE CLERIC

Year	Type/Case	Conviction	Sentence (include copies of civil documents)
1981	Felony Child Abuse, Violation of Section 288(a) of the State Penal Code.	Nolo contendere plea	Conviction on three counts, sentenced to serve time at Atascadero State Hospital for Criminal Sex Offenders.
2003	Civil lawsuit for damages (BC307934), REDACTED	pending	
2003	Civil lawsuit for damages (BC30791), REDACTED and REDACTED	pending	
2003	Civil lawsuit for damages (BC307364), REDACTED	pending	
2003	Civil lawsuit for damages (BC308608), REDACTED	pending	
2003	Civil lawsuit for damages (BC304904), REDACTED and REDACTED	pending	
2003	Civil lawsuit for damages (82750), REDACTED	pending	

MEASURES ADOPTED BY THE DIOCESE

Year	
1981	Placed on Sick Leave

SUSTENANCE PROVIDED BY THE DIOCESE TO THE CLERIC

The Archdiocese provided legal assistance to Father Roemer when he was first arrested. Other support was provided to him. He secured the services of a canonical advocate and an agreement for transition assistance was negotiated in , and an agreement was reach

RESPONSE/RECOURSE MADE BY THE CLERIC	
Year	
BISHOP'S <i>VOTUM</i>	
<p>On March 21, 2003, I submitted a petition to His Holiness for a dismissal of Father Roemer from the clerical state. In a letter dated October 13, 2003, Cardinal Ratzinger requested additional information about the case.</p> <p>Subsequently, while preparing to provide that additional information, Father Roemer indicated a willingness to petition for a dispensation from the obligations of the clerical state (laicization). That petition, in his own hand, has now been received.</p> <p>I hereby request that, for the good of the Church and for the spiritual welfare of Donald Patrick Roemer, this petition be granted as quickly as possible.</p>	



CONGREGATIO
PRO DOCTRINA FIDEI

00120 Città del Vaticano, October 13, 2003
Palazzo del S. Ufficio

PROT. N. 165/03 - 17774

(In responsione fiat mentio buli numeri)

Your Eminence,

The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith has received your letter of 7 April 2003 and the documentation for the **Reverend Donald Patrick ROEMER**, a priest of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles accused of sexual abuse of a minor, for whom you are requesting a dismissal *ex officio et in poenam*.

To aid our study of the case, this Congregation would ask Your Eminence kindly to send to us information regarding the conduct and actions of Fr. Roemer since the events of 1981, specifying precisely, whether or not there are more instances of alleged abuse. In fact, from the documentation at hand, it appears that the alleged delicts committed by Fr. Roemer, for which Your Eminence is now seeking his dismissal from the clerical state, are subject to prescription. It would therefore be most helpful to receive and review recent documentation and evidence which would establish beyond doubt that Fr. Roemer constitutes a grave risk to minors and could abuse the priestly ministry to perpetrate serious crimes against the young. It must also be noted that no documentation regarding the actions taken by the Archdiocese with regard to Fr. Roemer, neither in the past nor at present, appear in the documentation Your Eminence has sent.

In order to expedite the examination of this case, we kindly ask Your Excellency to arrange that a summary of the case be tabulated according to the example enclosed. Every element of the summary should be supported by the relevant documents, either in the original or in an authentic copy.

I take this opportunity to offer Your Eminence my sincere sentiments of esteem. With every best wish, I remain,

devotedly yours in the Lord

Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger

- Enclosure -

His Eminence
Card. **Roger M. MAHONY**
Archbishop of Los Angeles
3424 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90010-2241 U.S.A.

409797

**PETITION OF CARDINAL ROGER M. MAHONY,
ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES IN CALIFORNIA**

**FOR THE *EX OFFICIO* DISMISSAL
FROM THE CLERICAL STATE**

**TO BE IMPOSED ON
REVEREND DONALD PATRICK ROEMER**

**SUBMITTED IN ACCORD WITH THE PROVISIONS
OF ARTICLE 17,
*SACRAMENTORUM SANCTITATIS TUTELA***

CURIA OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES IN CALIFORNIA

**PETITION OF CARDINAL ROGER M. MAHONY
FOR *EX OFFICIO* DISMISSAL FROM THE CLERICAL STATE
TO BE IMPOSED ON REVEREND DONALD PATRICK ROEMER**

**SUBMITTED IN ACCORD WITH THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 17
*SACRAMENTORUM SANCTITATIS TUTELA***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Petition from Cardinal Mahony, March 21, 2003.	1
2. Summary of Salient Facts, March 21, 2003	4
3. Chronology of Events	6
4. <i>Votum</i> of Cardinal Mahony	8
5. Statement of the Vicar for Clergy	11
6. Legal Documentation	13
a. Felony Complaint, January 29, 1981	14
b. Superior Court: Statement of Facts	19
c. Superior Court: Felony Disposition Agreement	75
7. Selected Documentation form the Media	80
a. <i>Ventura County Star Free Press</i> , March 3, 1981.	81
b. <i>Ventura County Star Free Press</i> , March 10, 1981	83
c. <i>Ventura County Star Free Press</i> , May 30, 1981	84
d. <i>Daily News</i> , June 7, 1981	85
e. <i>Daily News</i> , June 8, 1981	86
f. <i>Newsweek</i> , August 9, 1982	87
g. <i>Los Angeles Times</i> , June 3, 1983	91
8. Certificate of the Authenticity of the Acts	93

1

Petition for the Imposition, *Ex Officio*, of Dismissal from the Clerical State

409800



2

Archdiocese of Los Angeles

Office of
the Archbishop

3424
Wilshire
Boulevard

Los Angeles
California
90010-2241

March 21, 2003

His Holiness
John Paul II
00120 Vatican City State
Europe

RE: Donald Patrick Roemer

Your Holiness:

In this season of Lent, please know that you are in my prayers as you continue to shepherd our Church in this time of war and crisis.

I am writing to request an *ex officio* dismissal from the clerical state of Reverend Donald Patrick Roemer. I make this request in accord with the provision of the revisions recently made to the *motu proprio, Sacramentorum Sanctitatis tutela*, specifically the amendment to Article 17 that was made on 7 February 2003.

The circumstances of Father Roemer involve a grave and clear case provided for in the above-mentioned amendment. A brief summary is attached that sketches the salient points at issue.

The case is clear because there is no doubt whatsoever that he committed the ecclesiastical and civil crime of sexual abuse of minors. This is established by the fact that Father Roemer admitted to this misconduct on different occasions, most importantly by entering a plea of "No Contest" before the criminal courts of the State of California in March of 1981. In the laws of the State of California, a plea of no contest is an admission of guilt. Father Roemer served time in a state mental institute for criminal sex offenders as a result of this criminal conviction. All this is established in public records.

This is a particularly grave case in that the abuse involved at least seven minor boys over a significant period of time.

This is also a notorious case, in that Father Roemer's crime received news coverage at the time, including a national publication. Information about his conviction and abusive activities has surfaced anew by the media during this past year.

Given that there is no doubt of the facts, it would be unnecessary and unduly onerous to deal with his case in the ecclesiastical judicial process. It would also require that we again burden those

3


-2-

harmd by Father Roemer by seeking their testimony for the sake of the ecclesiastical trial. They have already been harmed grievously, and I wish to act in a way that does not reopen wounds or add to their distress.

Therefore, for the good of the Church, I ask that you impose dismissal from the clerical state on Father Donald Patrick Roemer.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. With gratitude for your service of the Church and for your kindness, I am

Sincerely Yours in Christ,

+ 
His Eminence
Cardinal Roger M. Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles

enclosure

409802

CCI 005302

4

Summary of Salient Facts

409803

CCI 005303

5

Reverend Donald Patrick Roemer

Donald Patrick Roemer was born on March 17, 1944 and ordained as a priest for the service of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles on May 23, 1970.

On January 26, 1981, Father Roemer was placed under arrest for child molestation by the Sheriff of the County of Ventura, located within the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. He acknowledged such misconduct on that occasion.

On March 10, 1981, before the Superior Court, Father Roemer admitted to criminal misconduct with three different boys, and entered the formal plea of "no contest." In the criminal law of this jurisdiction, a plea of "no contest" is an admission of guilt. On May 29, 1991, he was sentenced to ten years at Atascadero State Hospital, a facility for sexual criminal offenders. In accord with the sentencing laws then in place, he received probation two years later.

Father Roemer's situation received extensive press coverage at the time. His case was even reported in the August 9, 1982 of the national magazine, *Newsweek*. In the past year, the media have again brought this past criminal conviction into public discussion.

Extensive civil litigation resulted from the abusive conduct of Father Roemer. Since the first report of abusive activities, we have confirmation that Father Roemer abused at least seven different children. There is a recent report that there may be yet another person who suffered abuse at his hands.

Father Roemer has previously been invited to petition for dispensation from the obligations of the clerical state but has not done so.

6

**Chronology of Events
Related to Reverend Donald Patrick Roemer**

409805

CCI 005305

**Reverend Donald Patrick Roemer
Chronology**

May 23, 1970	Ordained a Priest
June 1970 - June 1974	Parochial Vicar, St. Raphael Parish, Santa Barbara
June 1974 - December 1975	Parochial Vicar, San Roque Parish, Santa Barbara
December 1975 - April 1977	Chaplain, Santa Barbara Juvenile Hall
April 1977 - June 1978	Los Prietos Boys Camp, Santa Barbara
June 1978 - January 1981	Parochial Vicar, St. Paschal Baylon Parish, Thousand Oaks
January 26, 1981	Father Roemer called to the Ventura County Sheriff Station as a result of complaints of child molestation.
January 30, 1981	Preliminary hearing on nine counts; initial plea of "innocent"
February 1981	Sick Leave
March 10, 1981	At a court hearing, Father Roemer entered a plea of "No Contest" to three counts of child molesting
May 1981	Psychological Assessment at the House of Affirmation
June 1981 - April 1983	Confinement at Atascadero State Hospital (for criminal sex offenders)
April 1983	Released from Atascadero, ordered to stay at St. Joseph Convalescent Hospital pending sentencing
May 26, 1983	Sentence of eight years, four months, pronounced and suspended; sentenced to ten years probation
1984 - 1986	Civil lawsuits for damages; ended in settlement

8

***Votum* of the Diocesan Bishop of Incardination**

**Cardinal Roger M. Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles in California**

409807



9

 Archdiocese of Los Angeles

 Office of
the Archbishop

 3424
Wilshire
Boulevard

 Los Angeles
California
90010-2241

VOTUM OF CARDINAL ROGER MICHAEL MAHONY

April 7, 2003

His Holiness
Pope John Paul II
00120 Vatican City State
Europe

RE: Donald Patrick Roemer

Your Holiness:

It is with urgency yet with deep sadness that I write to urge the dismissal from the clerical state of DONALD PATRICK ROEMER. I refer you to my earlier letter dated 21 March 2003 in which I requested his *ex officio* dismissal. That initial petition sketched the vitally important reasons for making this request. By means of this *votum*, as advised by the officials of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, I wish to provide some additional information in support of this request.

As mentioned in my earlier letter, Father Roemer's case is a particularly egregious one. As the result of a plea bargain, Father Roemer entered a plea of "no contest" to three counts of child molestations. This was the result of a plea bargain. He was actually charged with nine counts (nine separate victims) and the criminal court documents at indicated that there were five other victims not included in the nine counts. The victims ranged from age six to age fifteen. Since these events, a number of other people have come forward to the Archdiocese claiming to have suffered abuse at the hands of Father Roemer.

At the time of his arrest, trial and sentencing, Father Roemer's case received significant attention in the media. Father Roemer's case received national press coverage in the August 9, 1982 issue of *Newsweek* magazine. Samples of articles that appeared at that time, including the *Newsweek* piece, are included with the documentation accompanying this *votum*.

As of this date, Father Roemer's case has not been recycled in the media. Five new civil claims for damage, however, are among prospective lawsuits to be filed. While we are making efforts to resolve these and other potential claims by mediation, there is a strong likelihood that these civil suits will be filed and engender significant new publicity.

409808

10

Votum of Cardinal Roger M. Mahony
RE: Richard Allen Henry
Page 2

Father Roemer has been out of any active priestly ministry since 1981. He has no faculties and no authorization to conduct priestly ministry. He has not, however, petitioned for a dispensation from the obligations of the priesthood. This fact causes concern, consternation and wonderment on the part of many of our people. And with the large number of his victims, the detailed descriptions of his crimes that are easily available as part of the public record, and the likely prospect of continued media attention, it is a source of scandal to at least some of our people.

Father Roemer's taped admissions along with his plea and criminal conviction (all included in the enclosed documentation) leave no doubt of his guilt. There is no possibility whatsoever that that he can or should ever be reinstated into ministry. In light of this, it is my firm conviction that it is necessary for the Church to act firmly and promptly by dismissing him from the clerical state.

Therefore, I respectfully request that you act to dismiss Donald Patrick Roemer from the clerical state.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours in Christ,
REDACTED

REDACTED

409809

CCI 005309

//

**Statement of the Vicar for Clergy
Monsignor Craig A. Cox, J.C.D.**

409810


**Statement of the Vicar for Clergy
Regarding Reverend Donald Patrick Roemer**

I was appointed Vicar for Clergy of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles and have served in this office since January 1, 2001. As part of my responsibilities, I am the custodian of clergy files and I am responsible for the assignment, spiritual welfare and continuing formation of the priests and deacons of this Archdiocese.

Let me first note that we have chosen not to send copies of the entire file related to Reverend Donald Patrick Roemer. The voluminous material in his file is contained in six separate large file folders. Much of the material is related to the various civil lawsuits that were lodged against the Archdiocese of Los Angeles as a result of Father Roemer's misconduct. Many of the other documents relate to the financial support provided to victims and to Father Roemer during his transition, as well as to the therapeutic assistance provided for Father Roemer. I attest that the selected materials included with this request for *ex officio* dismissal from the clerical state fairly and accurately document the essential facts verifying his misconduct.

I concur with the reasons offered by Cardinal Mahony for requesting the dismissal of Father Roemer from the clerical state. In this case, to seek a dispensation from prescription and the to conduct a full ecclesiastical trial of dismissal would be both unnecessary and unduly onerous. I wish to add one further reason to support the request of Cardinal Mahony. The presbyterate of this Archdiocese is made up of many extraordinarily fine men. They, sadly, have been badly and unfairly battered by the storm of controversy that has raged in this past year. In my assessment, the dismissal of such a notorious offender as Father Roemer will have the effect of supporting and strengthening the morale of the vast majority of good, holy and dedicated priests who have been unjustly tainted by those of our number who misused their spiritual authority to prey on the young and innocent. For the good of this local church, and specifically for the good of this presbyterate, I join my voice to that of Cardinal Mahony in requesting the intervention of the Holy Father to dismiss Donald Patrick Roemer from the clerical state.

Thank you for considering this vital request. May the Holy Spirit continue to guide you always.



Monsignor Craig A. Cox, J.C.D.
Vicar for Clergy

7 April 2003

13

Legal Documentation

409812

VENTURA COUNTY MUNICIPAL COURT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
HALL OF JUSTICE Department

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

PLAINTIFF,

No. _____

Vs.

DONALD PATRICK ROEMER,

COMPLAINT

☒ FELONY

☐ MISDEMEANOR
(Sect. 17b P.C.)

DEFENDANT.

COUNT I

K. McIlvain

, being first duly sworn, says that

DONALD PATRICK ROEMER

committed the crime of violation of section 288(a) of the Penal Code

a (felony), (Misdemeanor), in that on or about January 26, 1981

in Ventura County, California, he did willfully, unlawfully, and lewdly commit a lewd and lascivious act upon and with the body and certain parts and members thereof of REDACTED a child under the age of fourteen years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, and gratifying the lust, passions, and sexual desires of the said defendant and the said child.

COUNT II

Said complainant further accuses DONALD PATRICK ROEMER of committing the crime of violation of section 288(a) of the Penal Code, a felony, in that on or about January 19, 1981, in Ventura County, California, he did willfully, unlawfully, and lewdly commit a lewd and lascivious act upon and with the body and certain parts and members thereof of REDACTED a child under the age of fourteen years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, and gratifying the lust, passions, and sexual desires of the said defendant and the said child.

15

COUNT III

Said complainant further accuses DONALD PATRICK ROEMER of committing the crime of violation of section 288(a) of the Penal Code, a felony, in that on or about January 19, 1981, in Ventura County, California, he did willfully, unlawfully, and lewdly commit a lewd and lascivious act upon and with the body and certain parts and members thereof of REDACTED a child under the age of fourteen years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, and gratifying the lust, passions, and sexual desires of the said defendant and the said child.

COUNT IV

Said complainant further accuses DONALD PATRICK ROEMER of committing the crime of violation of section 288(a) of the Penal Code, a felony, in that on or about January 12, 1981, in Ventura County, California, he did willfully, unlawfully, and lewdly commit a lewd and lascivious act upon and with the body and certain parts and members thereof of REDACTED a child under the age of fourteen years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, and gratifying the lust, passions, and sexual desires of the said defendant and the said child.

COUNT V

Said complainant further accuses DONALD PATRICK ROEMER of committing the crime of violation of section 288(a) of the Penal Code, a felony, in that on or about November 29, 1980, in Ventura County, California, he did willfully, unlawfully, and lewdly commit a lewd and lascivious act upon and with the body and certain parts and members thereof of REDACTED a child under the age of fourteen years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, and gratifying the lust, passions, and sexual desires of the said defendant and the said child.

COUNT VI

Said complainant further accuses DONALD PATRICK ROEMER of committing the crime of violation of section 288(a) of the Penal Code, a felony, in that on and between January 1, 1980 and June 30, 1980, in Ventura County, California, he did willfully, unlawfully, and lewdly commit a lewd and lascivious act upon and with the body and certain parts and members thereof of REDACTED a child under the age of fourteen years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, and gratifying the lust, passions, and sexual desires of the said defendant and the said child.

COUNT VII

Said complainant further accuses DONALD PATRICK ROEMER of committing the crime of violation of section 647a of the Penal Code, a misdemeanor, in that on and between June 1, 1980 and July 31, 1980, in Ventura County, California, he did willfully and unlawfully annoy and molest a child, REDACTED under the age of eighteen years.

16

COUNT VIII

Said complainant further accuses DONALD PATRICK ROEMER of committing the crime of violation of section 647a of the Penal Code, a misdemeanor, in that on or about December 27, 1980, in San Diego County, California he did willfully and unlawfully annoy and molest a child, REDACTED under the age of eighteen years, and did commit acts and cause effects thereof constituting and requisite to the consummation of the said annoying and molesting in Ventura County.

COUNT IX

Said complainant further accuses DONALD PATRICK ROEMER of committing the crime of violation of section 288(a) of the Penal Code, a felony, in that on or about May 11, 1980, in San Bernardino County, California, he did willfully unlawfully, and lewdly commit a lewd and lascivious act upon and with the body and certain parts and members thereof of REDACTED a child under the age of fourteen years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, and gratifying the lust, passions, and sexual desires of the said defendant and the said child, and did commit acts and cause effects thereof constituting and requisite to the consummation of the said lewd and lascivious act in Ventura County.

409815

will recommended by

District Attorney:

OR

Deputy:

Officer:

Vacation from 197

197

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 29th day of January, 1981.

/s/ Joseph E. Taylor, Jr.

Deputy District Attorney, Ventura County

CCI 005315

PENAL CODE

(Pen. Code, § 286) having sexual intercourse it was sodomy or impeachment of evidence of a sexual act in defendant's where the evidence a prior time defendant consented; but on is instead asked if is during the prior consent victim, that he get away with it; ent was never admitted to him, and questions on cross-examination to the jury victim of a prior defendant successfully depleading consent, could use the same as to paint a sign it," however, the of the clear and the evidence of of the fact that could have viobrook (1974) 43

accomplices

allegedly perpetrated a locked jail cell trial court could the circumstances place and that his sufficient basis are the boy had and had never lifted that he was previously enarious homosexhim in the two defendant and his that he would ult if he did not), and where he ild beat him up anyone. Thus it nsent to the act at bodily harm. 108 Cal Rptr

knowingly, voluntarily with the n of the crime. law, means a the possession y to make an g proposed by d 651, 108 Cal

Pen Code]

PENAL CODE

§ 288

16. In General

In a prosecution of defendant for burglary and other crimes, evidence showing that defendant raped the victim twice, sodomized her and compelled her several times to orally copulate him over two-hour period was insufficient to support the jury's finding that he inflicted "great bodily injury" on the victim within the meaning of Pen. Code, § 461, which prescribes enhanced punishment for the intentional infliction of such injury.

Neither forcible rape, sodomy, nor oral copulation can, in and of themselves, constitute great bodily injury for the enhancement of punishment provision of burglary, and neither can the commission of such offenses together, without any additional physical manifestations or consequences, constitute such injury. *People v Caudillo* (1978) 21 C3d 562, 146 Cal Rptr 859, 580 P2d 274.

§ 286.1. [Repealed by Stats 1975 ch 71 § 8.]

See § 286.

§ 286.5. [Sexually assaulting animal]

Any person who sexually assaults any animal protected by Section 597f for the purpose of arousing or gratifying the sexual desire of the person is guilty of a misdemeanor.

Added Stats 1975 ch 71 § 8.5.

21 Cal Jur 3d Criminal Law § 3335.

Review of Selected 1975 Code Legislation. 7 Pacific LJ 366.

§ 287. [Penetration sufficient to complete the crime]

Any sexual penetration, however slight, is sufficient to complete the crime of sodomy.

Amended Stats 1975 ch 71 § 9.

Amendments:

1975 Amendment: Substituted "of sodomy" for "against nature".

Witkin Crimes pp 494, 496.

21 Cal Jur 3d Criminal Law § 2331.

Review of Selected 1975 Code Legislation. 7 Pacific LJ 366.

A state statute prohibiting "crimes against nature" is not unconstitutionally vague for failing to give fair warning to a man convicted under it for forcing a woman to submit to his acts of cunnilingus, where the phrase "crime against nature" had been considered by the courts of some states to encompass acts of cunnilingus, the broad interpretation of "crime against nature" as including forms of sexual aberration beyond those acts constituting the common law offense of sodomy, as opposed to the narrow interpretation of "crime against nature" being limited only to acts constituting sodomy at common law, was not itself uncon-

stitutionally vague, the state's highest court, although not specifically holding that cunnilingus fell within the statute, had given clear notice in its decisions that the statute would receive the broader of two plausible interpretations and would be applied to acts of cunnilingus when such a case arose, and there was no possibility of retroactive lawmaking whereby a criminal statute, narrow and precise on its face, would be expanded by judicial construction to encompass acts clearly outside the scope of the statute as written. *Rose v Locke* (1975) 423 US 48, 46 L Ed 2d 185, 96 S Ct 243.

§ 288. [Crimes against children: Lewd or lascivious acts: Punishment]

(a) Any person who shall willfully and lewdly commit any lewd or lascivious act including any of the acts constituting other crimes provided for in Part 1 of this code upon or with the body, or any part or member thereof, of a child under the age of 14 years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust or passions or sexual desires of such person or of such child, shall be guilty of a felony and shall be imprisoned in the state prison for a term of three, five, or seven years.

[2 Pen Code]

121

409816

§ 647a

CRIMES AND PUNISHMENT

18

SUGGESTED FORM

Allegation Charging Disorderly Conduct

[For general form of complaint, see form set out under § 740.]

_____, being duly sworn, states on information and belief that the defendant[s] did in the _____ [City of _____, County of _____ or _____ Judicial District, County of _____], State of California, on or about _____, 19____, commit a misdemeanor, to wit: A violation of Section 647, subsec. _____, of the Penal Code of the State of California, in that _____ [he or she or they] _____ [insert one of the following allegations]:

[Subd (a)] _____ did _____ [solicit another to engage or engage] in lewd or dissolute conduct, to wit: _____ in _____ [a public place or a place open to the public or a place exposed to public view], to wit: _____.

[Subd (b)] _____ did _____ [solicit or engage in] an act of prostitution.

[Subd (c)] _____ did accost other persons in _____ [a public place or a place open to the public], to wit: _____, for the purpose of begging or soliciting alms.

[Subd (d)] _____ did loiter in or about a toilet open to the public, to wit: _____, for the purpose of _____ [engaging in or soliciting] a _____ [lewd or lascivious or unlawful] act, to wit: _____.

[Subd (e)] _____ did _____ [loiter or wander] upon _____ [street or other place] without apparent reason or business and refused to identify himself and to account for his presence when requested to do so by a peace officer.

[Subd (f)] _____ was found in a public place, to wit: _____, under the influence of _____ [intoxicating liquor or a drug or toluene or any substance defined as a poison in Schedule D of Section 4160 of the Business and Professions Code or any combination of the foregoing] in such condition _____ [that he was unable to exercise care for his own safety or the safety of others or by reason of his being under the influence of _____ (intoxicating liquor, etc.) _____ (interfered with or obstructed or prevented) the free use of the _____ (street or sidewalk or other public way)].

[Subd (g)] _____ did _____ [loiter or prowl or wander] upon the private property of another, to wit: _____, in the nighttime, without visible or lawful business with the _____ [owner or occupant] thereof.

[Subd (h)] _____ did, while _____ [loitering or prowling or wandering] upon the private property of another, to wit: _____, in the nighttime, peek in the _____ [door or window] of an inhabited _____ [building or structure] located thereon, without visible or lawful business with the _____ [owner or occupant] thereof.

[Subd (i)] _____ did lodge in a _____ [building or structure or other place], to wit: _____, without the permission of _____, the _____ [owner or person entitled to the possession or person in control] thereof.

[For form of allegation charging prior convictions see form set out under § 644.]

§ 647a. [Annoying or molesting children]

Every person who annoys or molests any child under the age of 18 is a vagrant and is punishable upon first conviction by a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars (\$500) or by imprisonment in the county jail for not exceeding six months or by both such fine and imprisonment and is punishable upon the second and each subsequent conviction or upon the first conviction after a previous conviction under Section 288 of this code by imprisonment in the state prison for not less than one year.

19

1 MICHAEL D. BRADBURY
 2 District Attorney
 3 JOSEPH E. TAYLOR
 4 Deputy District Attorney
 5 800 South Victoria Avenue
 6 Ventura, CA 93009

7 Telephone (805) 654-2518

8 Attorney for Plaintiff

9
 10 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF VENTURA

11 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)
 12 Plaintiff,)

COURT NO.

13 vs.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

14 DONALD PATRICK ROEMER,

Defendant.)

20

TOPICAL INDEX

	<u>PAGE</u>
1	
2	
3	1
4	2
5	2
6	2
7	2
8	2
9	2
10	4
11	4
12	4
13	4
14	5
15	8
16	9
17	9
18	10
19	
20	11
21	11
22	11
23	
24	12
25	12
26	
27	13
28	

21

	<u>PAGE</u>
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

COUNT IV: REDACTED

Statement of REDACTED to VSO Sergeant
Jack Hughes

Statement of REDACTED to District
Attorney Investigator Pete Smart

COUNT V: REDACTED

Statement of REDACTED
REDACTED to VSO Detective Kelli McIlvain

Efforts by District Attorney's Office to
Interview REDACTED

COUNT VI: REDACTED PC 288(a)

Statement of REDACTED to VSO Detective
Kelli McIlvain

Statement of REDACTED to District Attorney
Investigator

Statement of REDACTED to District
Attorney Investigator REDACTED

COUNT VII: REDACTED , PC 288(a)

Statement of REDACTED to VSO Detective
Kelli McIlvain

Statement of REDACTED to District Attorney
Investigator

COUNT VIII: REDACTED PC 288(a)

Report of VSO Deputy Joseph Cipollini

Statement of REDACTED

Statement of REDACTED

Report of REDACTED

Statement

22

	PAGE
1	
2	Statement of REDACTED 23
3	Report of VSO Lt. Braden McKinley 24
4	REDACTED
5	Contact with Father 24
6	Sacred Heart
7	Contact with REDACTED and discussion 24
8	concerning REDACTED
9	Report of District Attorney Investigator 24
10	Pete Smart
11	REDACTED
12	Statement of Mrs. 25
13	Statement of REDACTED 25
14	Statement of Mrs REDACTED concerning 26
15	conversations with REDACTED
16	Efforts to Interview REDACTED 27
17	
18	ADDITIONAL VICTIMS 28
19	REDACTED 28
20	A.
21	Statement of REDACTED to VSO 28
22	Detective Kelli McIlvain
23	Statement of REDACTED to District 28
24	Attorney Investigator Pete Smart
25	REDACTED 30
26	B.
27	Statement of REDACTED to VSO 30
28	Detective Kelli McIlvain
29	REDACTED 30
30	C.
31	Statement of REDACTED to VSO Sergeant 30
32	Jack Hughes
33	REDACTED 31
34	D.
35	Report of VSO Deputy William Montijo 31
36	Efforts to locate and interview REDACTED 31
37	REDACTED

23

1	REDACTED	PAGE
2	Statement of	31
3	REDACTED	32
4	Report of VSO Detective Kelli McIlvain	32
5	Statement of REDACTED Director of	
6	Special Education, Conejo Valley Unified	
7	School District	32
8	REDACTED	
9	Efforts to contact	32
10	Statement of REDACTED Teacher of	
11	Special Education	32
12	EXHIBIT "A"	
13	Verbatim transcript of first 30 minutes of	
14	taped statement of Donald Patrick Roemer	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

409822

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

INTRODUCTION

The following "Statement of Facts" prepared by the People of the State of California includes all statements taken in the case by investigators of the Ventura County Sheriff's Department and the Ventura County District Attorney's Office.

The material is organized by the order of the charges filed in the Information, and statements relating to uncharged victims are included under the heading "Additional Victims."

A verbatim transcript of the statement of Donald Patrick Roemer is marked Exhibit "A," attached, and incorporated herein by reference.

This "Statement of Facts" is submitted by the People of the State of California as proof of the factual basis of the pleas of nolo contendere by Donald Patrick Roemer to Counts I, II, and III of the Information.

25

STATEMENT OF FACTS

REDACTED

COUNT I:

On January 26, 1981, the Ventura County Sheriff's Office, East Valley Station, received a report of a possible child molest from REDACTED 23 West Lucero, Thousand Oaks.

Deputy REDACTED responded to the call. He reported:

On 1-26-81 at about 1935 hours, I arrived at the victim's home re: a possible child molest. I contacted the victim's parents who gave this account: Mr. REDACTED told me that on 1/26/81 at about 1800 hours, victim REDACTED and the family were eating dinner. REDACTED told the family about the following incident: On 1/26/81, REDACTED went to CCD classes. Suspect, Father Patrick Roemer, asked REDACTED to look at some old pictures. REDACTED said that Father Roemer rubbed REDACTED stomach and then his "doofer." REDACTED told me that "doofer" means penis in their family. REDACTED said that Father Roemer started to shake. REDACTED said he was scared.

REDACTED told me that REDACTED has a teacher and a helper in the CCD class. They are REDACTED REDACTED and REDACTED (See F/U Det. McIlvain for phone.) REDACTED said she called Mrs. REDACTED and told her REDACTED the incident. Mrs. REDACTED advised Mrs. REDACTED to call the church and talk to the senior priest about it. I talked to the victim, REDACTED a 7-year-old boy with blond hair and blue eyes. I first showed REDACTED my black flashlight and asked him what color it was. He said it was black. I asked him if I would be lying if I said the flashlight was yellow and he said yes. I asked if it was wrong to tell a lie and he said yes. I asked REDACTED if he would tell the truth and he said yes. Again, I stressed the importance of telling the truth.

REDACTED gave the following account: Today (1/26/81), his teacher, Mrs. REDACTED picked up REDACTED and drove him to CCD classes. The children play in the yard for awhile and then go to class. REDACTED put his books down on a bench away from the other kids; however, Father Roemer came out of his office and asked Brian to come inside and look at

REDACTED

1 some pictures. went into the office and
2 Father Roemer sat in a chair near a desk. Father
3 Roemer lifted REDACTED up and placed REDACTED on the
4 Father's leg, far enough back so that REDACTED was
5 close to the Father's chest.

REDACTED

6 Father Roemer showed a book with pictures
7 from when Father Roemer went to school. REDACTED
8 said it was the kind of book where everyone in the
9 class takes pictures together. I asked if he
10 meant a school yearbook and he said yes. While
11 looking at the book, Father Roemer put his hand
12 under REDACTED T-shirt and started to rub REDACTED
13 stomach. I asked REDACTED to show me by rubbing his
14 own stomach. REDACTED made slow circular movements
15 on his stomach. REDACTED said that Father Roemer
16 rubbed REDACTED stomach for about one-half minute.
17 Father Roemer then slid his hand down into REDACTED
18 pants and inside REDACTED underpants. Father
19 Roemer started to rub REDACTED doofer. Father
20 Roemer rubbed REDACTED doofer for a couple of
21 minutes and then Father Roemer started shaking.
22 His hands and legs were shaking and Father Roemer
23 said, "I'm cold." REDACTED told me it was hot in the
24 room and that Father Roemer was wearing a jacket
25 or coat. REDACTED told me that he became scared and
26 asked Father Roemer if he could go now. Father
27 Roemer said, "Okay."

REDACTED

28 went toward his class and on the way he told
his friend, REDACTED that Father Roemer had shown
him some pictures.

I asked REDACTED where his "doofer" was and he pointed
to his crotch area where his penis would be. I
asked REDACTED if he could tell me another name for
doofer, but he seemed too embarrassed. I asked
him if he used his doofer to go to the bathroom
and he said yes.

I put my pencil on the kitchen table and told
REDACTED to pretend that my pencil was REDACTED doofer
and to show me how Father Roemer rubbed REDACTED
doofer. REDACTED made several short, fast strokes
on the pencil.

I talked to REDACTED again and she added that
Father Roemer was very friendly with children and
has taken several groups on field trips. Father
Roemer is the youth minister and active with all
the youth sports activities. Father Roemer was
not very involved in adult activities.

I contacted Det. K. McIlvain and told her the
above info. She called the church and left a
message for Father Roemer.

409825

1 On 1/26/81 at about 2230 hours, Father Roemer
2 called the East Valley Sheriff's Station. I
3 called Det. McIlvain at Los Robles and she advised
4 to ask Father Roemer to come to the station. I
5 told Father Roemer we were investigating a case
6 and we would appreciate it if he could come down
7 right away. Father Roemer said he wasn't busy and
8 would come to the station. He didn't ask why.

9 REDACTED had told me that this had never happened
10 before and that he never saw anyone else go into
11 the office with Father Roemer before.

12 REDACTED said no one else witnessed the incident.

13 On January 26, 1981, Det. Kelli McIlvain of the East
14 Valley Station responded to the REDACTED residence for the
15 purpose of reinterviewing REDACTED Det. McIlvain.
16 reported:

17 Following conversation with Deputy REDACTED, I
18 requested he have the victim and parents come to
19 the EVSO for interview. They arrived a few minutes
20 before 9 p.m.

21 Victim REDACTED 7-1/2 years, DOB:
22 4-18-73, said that today while at St. Paschal's
23 Church, T.O., about 3:30 p.m., just prior to CCD
24 classes (religious instruction), suspect asked him
25 into a small office saying, "Do you want to see
26 some pictures." The victim sat on the priest's
27 lap as the priest showed him pictures from a book.
28 (Described like a school yearbook.) As the boy
looked at the book, the suspect put his hand
inside the victim's shirt and rubbed his abdomen
and chest area. Suspect then put his hand inside
victim's clothing and rubbed his doofer (penis).
The suspect began shaking very hard and said to
the victim, "It's cold in here." The victim
finally asked the suspect if he could leave and
the suspect said yes. After he got outside the
office, he told Mrs. REDACTED
that Father Roemer had shown him some pictures.
He then went to CCD class which starts at 3:45 p.m.
He told his parents what had occurred at dinner.
Victim also said the suspect kissed him on the
neck, near the right ear, as he was rubbing him.
The whole incident lasted about five minutes.

29 REDACTED said she phoned REDACTED
30 teacher) after learning what occurred and Mrs.

28

1 REDACTED recalled REDACTED telling her that Father
 2 Roemer had shown him pictures. REDACTED after
 3 hearing REDACTED information, told her she
 4 would contact REDACTED an active church
 5 member, to see what should be done about the
 6 information. REDACTED recontacted REDACTED
 7 REDACTED, saying REDACTED said the police should be
 8 notified.

9 REDACTED had already decided to phone the
 10 police.

11 Prior to the interviews with REDACTED I
 12 phoned the church and left a message with REDACTED
 13 REDACTED to have Father Roemer phone me
 14 as soon as possible.

15 The suspect returned the call around 2245 hours.
 16 Deputy REDACTED talked with him and asked if he
 17 could come to EVSO. He said he would.

18 STATEMENT OF DONALD PATRICK ROEMER

19 Detective McIlvain's report continues:

20 I interviewed suspect in the EVSO on tape,
 21 following Miranda waiver, approximately 2300 hours.

22 Donald Patrick Roemer. DOB: 3-17-44. 36 years.
 23 REDACTED

24 Following is a narrative summary of taped
 25 interview.

26 The suspect, who has been a Catholic priest for 11
 27 years, said that everything that REDACTED
 28 said was probably true. Today, 1-26-81 around
 3:30 p.m., he asked the boy into the teachers'
 lounge on churchgrounds, had him sit on his lap,
 stroked his stomach, abdomen, and genitals. He
 also had the boy stand up next to him for awhile
 and stroked his penis. As the boy was sitting on
 his lap, he did begin to shake. He did make a
 remark about it being cold to cover up for the
 shaking. The suspect did have an erection and an
 ejaculation resultant from the fondling. The
 victim asked if he could go out to play and Father
 Roemer said yes. The total time suspect was
 stroking victim was about two minutes. When asked
 if he kissed the victim, he said he didn't recall,
 but if the victim said he kissed him, then he did.
 The suspect said he knew when the boy left the
 office that he would be found out. He also heard
 the victim yell to Mrs REDACTED that Father
 Roemer had just shown him pictures.

29

1 Suspect said he has been struggling with feelings
2 of a homosexual nature since he was young and
3 sought assistance while assigned to a parish in
4 Santa Barbara through a church psychologist.

5 The suspect also admitted that information given
6 by REDACTED was REDACTED and occur on 1-18-81.
7 (See statements of REDACTED under Count II.)

8 Also on 1-19-81, while in the teachers' lounge at
9 3:30 p.m., he rubbed the stomach, chest, and
10 underarm area of REDACTED 6th grade, 11 years.
11 (See statements of REDACTED under Count III.)

12 Two weeks ago, 1-12-81, teachers' lounge, he rubbed
13 stomach, chest of REDACTED 7-1/2 years.
14 (See statements of REDACTED under
15 Count IV.)

16 Father Roemer took a group of boys on a trip to
17 San Diego during the week following Christmas,
18 1980. They stayed in one hotel room with two
19 double beds. During this trip, at night, believing
20 REDACTED, 14 years, to be asleep next to him in the
21 bed, he touched his genitals.

22 Also during this trip, while sleeping with REDACTED
23 REDACTED, 14 years, he attempted to touch his
24 genitals, but the boy had not been asleep. He got
25 out of the bed and went and laid down on the
26 floor. The suspect asked him what was wrong and
27 the boy replied, "You felt too low." The suspect
28 then told the boy he would never do anything like
that (to cover up his actions) and that the boy
was wrong about his intentions. (See statements
of REDACTED under Count VII.)

19 The suspect also related that he had use of a
20 ranch in Fillmore, via relatives, from approximately
21 August 1979 to August 1980 where he often took
22 boys for the weekend or overnight. They would
23 sleep in sleeping bags on the living room floor.
24 REDACTED 13 years, and REDACTED
25 14 years, on separate occasions (one time each),
26 were stroked on stomach and chest area. (See
27 statements of REDACTED pages 28 to 30,
28 and REDACTED, pages 31 to 32.)

25 He stroked genitals and stomach of REDACTED
26 14 years, while asleep at the ranch on one, maybe
27 two occasions. (See statement of REDACTED
28 page 30.)

27 He also stroked stomach, chest area of REDACTED
28 REDACTED two or three times in the teachers' lounge

30

1 on churchgrounds.

2 The suspect was very cooperative, appeared truthful.
3 He said he usually had an erection during the
stroking activity and sometimes he ejaculated.

4 Suspect placed under arrest and booked EVSO.
5 Attached are photos of children in his wallet.
Red arrow is photo of REDACTED victim #2.

6 In a report prepared by Detective McIlvain on January 29,
7 1981, she stated:

8 On January 29, 1981, approximately 1615 hours, at
9 the direction of Deputy District Attorney Joe
Taylor, and while my conversation of 1/26/81 with
10 suspect Donald Patrick Roemer was still fresh in
my mind, I listened to the taped recording of that
11 conversation. The following is my word-for-word
accounting of the conversation from its beginning
12 through the Miranda waiver. All responses of
suspect are underlined. My statement/questions
are in quotes.

13 "I don't know if you are aware of the fact that
14 there is a family in Thousand Oaks that has a
young boy that is giving information accusing you
15 of child molest. The information was given this
evening and I felt like we should try to get in
16 touch with you as soon as we possibly could because
of the sensitivity of it. What is your whole
17 name, Father?"

18 Donald Patrick Roemer.

19 "And your date of birth?"

20 March 17, '44.

21 "Making you"

22 36.

23 "And your residence address?"

24 REDACTED

25 "Do you have your own phone there?"

26 Yes. Well, there's a house phone and I have a
27 private phone. The house phone is 496-0222.

28 "The house phone is kind of like a work phone
isn't it?"

31

1 It's a work phone and I have a private line. REDACTED
2 REDACTED.

3 "I'd like to talk to you about the information
4 given, but I have to read you your rights because
5 at this point you are a suspect in the crime of
6 child molest. Okay."

7 Yes (suspect nods yes)

8 "You understand that you're suspected of committing
9 the crime of child molest? Do you understand?"

10 (Suspect nods head) Inaudible yes.

11 "You have the right to remain silent. Do you
12 understand?"

13 UmmHumm.

14 "If you give up that right, anything you say can
15 and will be used against you in a court of law.
16 Do you understand?"

17 (Suspect nods yes) Inaudible yes.

18 "You have the right to talk to a lawyer and have
19 him present with you before and while being questioned.
20 Do you understand?"

21 (Suspect nods head) Inaudible yes.

22 "If you cannot afford to hire a lawyer, one will
23 be appointed to represent you before any questioning
24 at no cost to you, if you wish one. Do you understand?"

25 (Suspect nods yes) Inaudible yes.

26 "Do you understand all of these rights (cough/
27 excuse me) that I have explained to you?"

28 (Suspect nods yes) Inaudible yes.

 "Do you have any questions about these rights?"

No, I don't think so.

 "Having these rights in mind, do you wish to give
up these rights and talk to me about the charge
against you?"

I'd rather talk to you.

 "You would?"

32

1 Yes.

2 "Okay."

REDACTED

3 "Do you know a boy by the name of

4 The interview was approximately 60 minutes long,
5 only the first 30 minutes were recorded on tape.
6 On the tape, suspect discussed activity with both
7 REDACTED boys, victim REDACTED and REDACTED. Off
8 tape, but during second part of interview, he
9 discussed victims REDACTED and REDACTED in San Diego,
10 REDACTED REDACTED and REDACTED in Fillmore.

11 A verbatim transcript of the 30-minute taped portion of
12 the interview by Detective Kelli McIlvain of Donald Patrick
13 Roemer on January 26, 1981 is marked Exhibit "A," attached, and
14 fully incorporated herein by reference in this "Statement of
15 Facts."

16 On February 4, 1981, District Attorney Investigator
17 REDACTED interviewed REDACTED and reported:

18 On February 4, 1981 at approximately 5 p.m.,
19 I interviewed REDACTED in the company of both
20 parents at his residence. Deputy District
21 Attorney REDACTED was present and participated
22 in the interview.

23 REDACTED is a 7-year-old, 2nd grade student at
24 University Elementary School in Thousand Oaks.
25 He attends CCD classes at St. Paschal's Church
26 and has done so for three years. His CCD
27 teacher is REDACTED who also transports
28 him to and from class.

29 REDACTED related the following information: I see
30 Father Roemer every time I go to CCD classes.
31 He always hugs me and kisses me on the head.
32 On January 26, 1981, when I got to CCD class,
33 Father Roemer came up and hugged me. He had a
34 book in his hand and said, "Come into the room
35 where the teachers meet (teachers' lounge) and
36 look at some pictures."

37 When we got in there, he picked me up and put
38 me on his lap. He was holding the book and
39 rubbing my "wiener." He told me to stand up
40 because it would be easier. He started shaking
41 after he started rubbing my "wiener." I asked

409831

33

1 him why he was shaking and he said because he
2 was cold. He still had his hand under my pants
and I asked him if I could go outside. He
3 said, "Sure" and took his hand out of my pants.

4 I went outside and told REDACTED that
5 Father Roemer had shown me some pictures and
6 tickled my chest.

7 When I got home and was eating dinner, I told my
8 Mom and Dad what had happened. I felt like a
9 "tattletale" for telling them.

10 I have never seen Father Roemer shake like that
11 before. When he was rubbing my "wiener," I
12 didn't tell him to stop because I was afraid.

13 On February 12, 1981, District Attorney Investigator
14 Pete Smart interviewed REDACTED by telephone.
15 Investigator Smart reported:

16 On February 12, 1981 at approximately 8 a.m.,
17 I telephoned the above witness regarding an
18 incident that occurred on January 26, 1981
19 involving Father Roemer and REDACTED

20 REDACTED is a teacher at St. Paschal's
21 Church in Thousand Oaks. She transports
22 several children to and from CCD classes,
23 including REDACTED and REDACTED and REDACTED
24 REDACTED

25 REDACTED related the following information:

26 On January 26, 1981, I drove REDACTED and REDACTED
27 REDACTED to CCD classes at St. Paschal's Church.
28 When we arrived, the boys got out of the car
and walked toward their classrooms. I went to
my classroom and then went to the supply room
to get some supplies for my class.

As I was returning from the supply room, en route
to my classroom, REDACTED came up to me and told me
that Father Roemer had taken him into his office
and had shown him some pictures. I made some
appropriate comment, like, "That's nice," or
something like that.

At that moment, Father Roemer walked up and asked
me what REDACTED had told me. Father Roemer asked if
REDACTED had told me that he had shown him some
pictures. The discussion was brief as it was time

34

1 for classes to start and REDACTED and I left for our
 2 classroom. I did not notice anything unusual
 3 about REDACTED that day, but I do recall he may have
 4 been nervous during class. He had to leave the
 5 classroom twice that day to go to the bathroom,
 6 which is unusual for REDACTED

7 In retrospect, I guess it was unusual for Father
 8 Roemer to walk up to me and ask what REDACTED had
 9 said to me. Father Roemer usually does not walk
 10 up to adults and talk to them. He spends the
 11 majority of his time with kids.

12 I know REDACTED quite well and I know in my heart he
 13 would not fabricate a story or lie about what has
 14 happened.

15 I have been very concerned about the entire
 16 incident because of the impact it has had on the
 17 community, the church, the young boys involved,
 18 and Father Roemer. I have a young son who is
 19 involved in the church and also attends CCD
 20 classes. I have questioned him about Father
 21 Roemer and he has denied that anything like that
 22 has happened or has been attempted. I feel confident
 23 he is being truthful.

24 COUNT II: REDACTED

25 On January 26, 1981, VSO Deputy Bruce McDowell ...
 26 interviewed REDACTED REDACTED, 10 years,
 27 DOB: 3-12-70, and reported:

28 He related that on 1/19/81, while suspect was
 hearing his confession, the suspect rubbed
 his stomach, chest, and underarm area (touching
 skin under his shirt). The suspect and REDACTED
 were sitting side-by-side in chairs. The
 suspect also kissed him on the right ear twice.

29 On February 4, 1981, District Attorney Investigator REDACTED
 30 REDACTED interviewed REDACTED and reported:

31 On February 4, 1981 at approximately 5:50 p.m.,
 32 I interviewed REDACTED in the company of both parents
 33 at his residence. Deputy District Attorney Joe
 34 Taylor was present and participated in the
 interview.

35 /////

409833

35

REDACTED

is 10 years old and is a 5th grade student at University Elementary School in Thousand Oaks. He is Catholic and attends St. Paschal's Church. He also attends CCD classes at the church on each Monday afternoon and is transported to and from the class by

REDACTED

REDACTED

related the following information:

On January 19, 1981, my entire CCD class went to confession. The confession was with Father Roemer who instructed me to sit on a bench in the confessional. Father Roemer sat beside me. He hugged me and kissed my right ear two times. At the same time, he put his hand under my shirt and started rubbing my stomach, chest and under my arm. He continued rubbing for 30-45 seconds and then stopped.

I finished with confession and left. I did not tell anyone what Father Roemer had done until REDACTED told my parents what had happened to him. Father Roemer has not done any thing like that to me before.

REDACTED

COUNT III:

On January 27, 1981, Sergeant Jack Hughes interviewed REDACTED 12 years, DOB 6-28-68, REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

reported:

REDACTED

REDACTED

interviewed 1/27/81.

told me he attends catechism classes at St. Paschal's Church every Monday from 1600 hours to 1700 hours. He first denied going into a teachers' lounge, but then stated he did after his mother described the room. This interview was recorded and REDACTED mother and father was present. He said that Father Roemer talked to him about how he was doing in school. He denied sitting on Father Roemer's lap. He told me he was afraid of getting Father Roemer in trouble. He did say that sometimes he (Father Roemer) put his hands under his REDACTED shirt. REDACTED Father Roemer scratching under his arm. REDACTED denies that Father Roemer scratched or rubbed his chest. He did say that he rubbed his stomach once. He didn't remember when. REDACTED then said he didn't want to talk about it anymore. His mother inquired as to why and he replied he just didn't want to talk about it.

409834

36

His parents told me they would call me if told
 them anymore. REDACTED father if REDACTED

On February 4, 1981, District Attorney Investigator
 Pete Smart interviewed REDACTED Investigator Smart
 reported:

On February 4, 1981 at approximately 3:30 p.m., I
 interviewed REDACTED in the presence of his mother
 at his residence in Thousand Oaks. Deputy District
 Attorney REDACTED was present and participated
 in the interview.

REDACTED is 12 years old. He is a 6th grade student
 at Acacia Elementary School in Thousand Oaks. He
 is Catholic and attends St. Paschal's Church and
 CCD classes in Thousand Oaks. He has been a
 member of St. Paschal's Church for approximately
 five years. Through his association with the
 church, he is acquainted with the defendant,
 Father Roemer.

REDACTED related the following information:

On January 5, 1981, while attending CCD classes on
 the churchgrounds, I was talking to Father Roemer
 about my new school. I was telling him that
 nobody there liked me and that was bothering me.
 Father Roemer said he knew that and asked me to go
 into the teachers' lounge with him to talk about
 it.

We went into the teachers' lounge and sat down on
 individual chairs. They were placed one behind
 the other. I sat down and Father Roemer sat
 directly behind me. We were talking about my new
 school. Father Roemer started rubbing my stomach
 and chest, under my shirt. He started shaking
 while he was rubbing me. He continued rubbing my
 stomach and chest for approximately five minutes.
 (At this point I asked him to estimate when five
 minutes had lapsed. We continued talking and Tim
 interrupted to tell me that five minutes had
 passed. The actual time that had lapsed was five
 minutes and six seconds, as timed by REDACTED
 stopwatch.

The next incident occurred the following week
 (January 12, 1981) at CCD classes. Father Roemer
 took me into the nurse's office. I thought he
 wanted to talk to me about my new school. I sat
 on a couch and Father Roemer sat behind me. He

409835

1 started rubbing my chest and under my arms. His
2 hand was under my shirt while he was rubbing.
3 This lasted for about three minutes and Father
4 Roemer was shaking while he rubbed me. We did not
5 say anything about the rubbing, but I was a little
6 concerned about it.

7 On the following week (January 19, 1981) at CCD
8 class, Father Roemer took me into the teachers'
9 lounge to talk to me about my new school.

10 We sat in individual chairs again. Father Roemer
11 sat behind me and put his hand under my shirt.
12 He started rubbing my chest and under my arms.
13 He was shaking, like he was nervous, while he
14 rubbed me. This time it lasted about eight
15 minutes. We talked about my new school and I
16 looked at a magazine while Father Roemer was
17 rubbing me. About two minutes after he stopped
18 rubbing, the bell rang and I went to class.

19 This is the last time anything happened. I did
20 not see Father Roemer when I first went to class
21 the next week (January 26, 1981). REDACTED
22 incident occurred on this date.)

23 REDACTED

24 COUNT IV:

25 On January 27, 1981, Sergeant REDACTED interviewed

26 REDACTED

27 REDACTED

28 Sergeant REDACTED reported:

REDACTED interview, 1/27/81.

I talked with REDACTED with his father, REDACTED
REDACTED present. The interview was
recorded. REDACTED told me he attends catechism
classes at St. Paschal's Church. He attends
class only on Mondays. He missed the class on
Jan. 19, 81, but was there on Jan. 12, 81. His
father confirmed these dates as REDACTED was not
sure of the dates. He told me sometimes he
sits on Father Roemer's lap and they talk about
football. He plays football for the Raiders.
REDACTED did not remember when he went to the
teachers' lounge with Father Roemer, maybe two
or three weeks ago. He said his father dropped
him off and he went to the lounge with Father
Roemer. They left the lounge prior to the class
bell ringing. He said he did not go in with
his shirt off. REDACTED said that in the lounge,
Father Roemer rubbed his chest and stomach. I
asked REDACTED to show me how Father Roemer rubbed
his chest. REDACTED pulled up his shirt and put

38

1 his hand under the shirt. He rubbed his
2 breast and stomach. I asked him what that part
3 of his body was called and he told me, "boobies."
4 He then said that Father Roemer rubbed his
5 boobies. He said Father Roemer never put his
6 hand inside his pants and Father Roemer never
7 asked him to touch any part of Father Roemer's
8 body. He said that Father Roemer only rubbed
9 his chest the one time in the room. REDACTED said
10 that Father Roemer shivered like he was cold
11 while rubbing him. Nobody was in the room when
12 this occurred. He did not tell anyone what had
13 happened and no one has told him it happened to
14 them also. I asked REDACTED how long the Father
15 rubbed him and he told me five minutes. I then
16 asked REDACTED to tell me about how long, to tell
17 me when to stop timing him, when it had been as
18 long as with the Father. REDACTED stopped me
19 around 40 seconds after I started timing him.
20 He told me he did not tell Father Roemer to stop.
21 I asked REDACTED if he knew what a lie was and he
22 told me it is when you don't tell the truth.

23 On February 4, 1981 at approximately 1:10 p.m., District
24 Attorney Investigator Pete Smart interviewed REDACTED
25 Investigator REDACTED reported:

26 On February 4, 1981 at approximately 1:10 p.m.,
27 I interviewed REDACTED in the presence of his
28 father at his residence. Deputy District
Attorney REDACTED was also present and
participated in the interview.

REDACTED is 8 years old and is a 2nd grade student
at La Dera Elementary School in Thousand Oaks.
He is Catholic and attends St. Paschal's Church
and CCD classes. He is acquainted with Father
Roemer through his association with the church.

REDACTED related the following information:

My Dad usually takes me to CCD classes and
drops me off. When I get there, I just walk
around, usually by myself until class starts.
I always see Father Roemer there. One day,
Father Roemer walked up to me and said, "Hi."
We started talking about football. Father Roemer
said he had won trophies and asked me if I wanted
to see them. We went into the teachers' lounge
and he closed the door. Father Roemer asked me to
sit down on the couch and he sat down beside me,
about six inches away from me.

409837

1 We were talking about football and he showed me a
2 medal he won in football. He stuck his hand under
3 my shirt and started rubbing my stomach and chest,
4 including my nipples. He asked me if it felt good
5 and I said, "Kinda."

6 Father Roemer had his hand on my leg while he was
7 rubbing my stomach. He was shivering while rubbing
8 my chest and stomach. He started shivering soon
9 after he started rubbing my stomach. When his
10 hand was on my leg, it was close to my privates,
11 but he did not touch them. After Father Roemer
12 stopped shivering, he told me I had better go out
13 now because classes were about to start.

14 I asked REDACTED if Father Roemer had ever done this
15 to him before. He said that he had about seven
16 times before, always outside on the churchgrounds
17 while he was waiting for CCD classes to start.
18 REDACTED said it only happened the one time in the
19 teachers' lounge and that was the only time he was
20 aware that Father Roemer shivered.

21 REDACTED said that he felt that it was "weird or
22 strange" that Father Roemer rubbed his stomach and
23 he felt uncomfortable and thought it was wrong.

24 REDACTED

25 COUNT V:

26 On January 28, 1981 at approximately 11 a.m., Detective
27 Kelli McIlvain received a telephone call from Mrs. REDACTED
28 regarding her son REDACTED Detective McIlvain reported:

29 Approximately 1100 hours, 1/28/81, I received a
30 phone call from Mrs. REDACTED. She related that
31 she had taken her son, REDACTED, 11 years, to
32 see suspect for some counseling around the middle
33 of November 1980. The suspect arranged to take
34 him to a drive-in movie the Saturday night after
35 Thanksgiving, 11/29/80. The suspect picked him up
36 about 8:30 p.m. and returned him early, around 10
37 p.m. When REDACTED got home, he said he was tired
38 and went right to bed. Either that same evening
39 or the following day, she received a phone call
40 from suspect. He said he just wanted to know how
41 REDACTED was doing. Mrs. REDACTED thought suspect was
42 just concerned. Another counseling appointment
43 was made with suspect, but REDACTED refused to go to
44 it. Then last night, following press article of
45 suspect's arrest, REDACTED told her that while at the
46 drive-in the suspect had touched his leg and he
47 (REDACTED) moved to the far side of the car and kept

40

1 his coat pulled tightly around himself. After a
2 while, he told the suspect he was tired and wanted
3 to go home, to get away from the suspect. Mrs.
4 REDACTED said she had talked with her son's pedia-
5 trician and that REDACTED has some emotional problems
6 stemming from abuse by his natural father and the
7 pediatrician recommended, and she concurred, that
8 REDACTED was not at a state where he should be inter-
9 viewed. She went on to say she felt the whole
10 thing should have been handled by the church. She
11 knows the Roemer family and has felt physically
12 ill ever since the news article came out. She was
13 very upset on the phone, crying. She did say,
14 near the end of the conversation, that she would
15 talk to her husband and possibly consider an
16 interview at a later date (Mr. REDACTED husband
17 had phoned me 1/27/81 and advised his stepson
18 could possibly have some information regarding the
19 case and he said his wife would bring him in for
20 an interview at 1 p.m., 1/28/81).

21 The District Attorney's Office made repeated efforts to
22 interview both REDACTED and REDACTED, but permission
23 was refused by Mrs. REDACTED. She stated that her son's
24 emotional condition was too precarious to permit such interviews,
25 and she had been advised by REDACTED pediatrician to avoid the
26 trauma of testifying in court. Mrs. REDACTED refused to
27 disclose the name of the doctor, and refused the offer of the
28 District Attorney's Office to put her doctor in contact with
29 Dr. REDACTED of the Harbor-UCLA Medical Center so that
30 the pediatrician would have the benefit of expert advice and
31 consultation in order to properly assess what the effects of
32 testifying would be on Lance. Shortly before the scheduled
33 preliminary hearing of March 3, 1981, Mrs. REDACTED retained
34 Attorney REDACTED and directed the District Attorney's
35 Office to deal with him.

/////

/////

41

REDACTED

COUNT VI:

On January 28, 1981, Detective Kelli McIlvain interviewed
 REDACTED 12 years, DOB REDACTED

REDACTED Detective REDACTED reported:

REDACTED 12 years DOB REDACTED
 REDACTED

Above witness interviewed on tape 1/28/81 at 1530
 hours in presence of his mother, REDACTED

He said that during the summer 1980, he attended
 Ernie Folley Sports Camp held at St. Paschal's
 School. It was held from Monday through Friday
 from about 8:30 a.m. to 1 p.m. He missed Monday's
 session. On Tuesday, his first day at the camp,
 the suspect stood close behind him, wrapped his
 arms around his chest area, leaned his (suspect)
 head down, chin resting on witness' head and was
 talking to him. This made REDACTED nervous and
 uncomfortable. For the rest of Tuesday he tried
 to avoid suspect. When his Mom picked him up
 Tuesday afternoon, he told her that he didn't want
 to return to the camp and explained what suspect
 had done. His Mom told him to avoid the suspect
 and she would come to the field early to pick him
 up every day and watch him. On Wednesday, witness
 felt like the suspect was looking for him all day.
 At one point, while witness was playing soccer,
 suspect came up to him and said, "You can't get
 away from me." On Thursday, while witness was
 playing football, the suspect told the witness
 that the witness was a pretty good runner and when
 he (suspect) was in school, he was a good runner
 too. He asked the witness to come to his office
 sometime and look at his sports pictures in his
 high school yearbook.

On February 4, 1981, District Attorney Investigator
 Pete Smart interviewed REDACTED Investigator Smart

reported:

On February 4, 1981 at approximately 9:30 a.m., I
 interviewed REDACTED at the East Valley Sheriff's
 Office in the presence of his mother, REDACTED
 Deputy District Attorney Joe Taylor was present
 during the interview. REDACTED is a 7th grade student
 at Ascension Lutheran School in Thousand Oaks.

409840

42

REDACTED

1 was questioned regarding his involvement with
2 the defendant, Father Donald Patrick Roemer. He
3 related the following information: I attended the
4 Ernie Folley Sports Camp at St. Paschal's Church
5 in Thousand Oaks on June 16 through June 21, 1980.
6 Father Roemer was present each day that I attended.
7 I was acquainted with Father Roemer, having first
8 met him while playing flag football in October
9 1979, but had no previous personal contact with
10 him.

11 On June 17, 1980, while at the sports camp, Father
12 Roemer came over to a bench where I was sitting
13 with three or four other boys. He said, "Hi,
14 how's it going?" and sat down between me and
15 another boy. He put his arm around my shoulder
16 and started asking questions. He asked me what my
17 name was, how old I was, what my favorite sport
18 was, and other similar questions. While he was
19 sitting there, his body was in contact with mine
20 and on at least two occasions, he placed his head
21 next to mine. His face would be very close to
22 mine when his head was leaning on my shoulder and
23 he would turn to talk to me.

24 Father Roemer said I was a nice boy and that I
25 could run very fast. At that point I got up and
26 went out to play basketball. While playing ball,
27 I saw Father Roemer put his head on the shoulder
28 of some other boys that were sitting on the bench.
I didn't see Father Roemer anymore that day.

When my Mom picked me up that day, I told her I
didn't want to go back because the priest was
doing weird things. After I told her about what
Father Roemer was doing, we stayed there for
awhile and watched him.

REDACTED

interjected that she watched
Father Roemer go from child to child, hugging,
touching, and kissing them. She saw him rubbing
their faces, heads and upper bodies. The kids
appeared to try to get away from him, but he would
resist their attempts. REDACTED stated her
observations made her very concerned about Father
Roemer's conduct and felt he was overly friendly.

REDACTED

continued: I returned to the sports camp on
June 18, but did not see Father Roemer on that
day. On June 19, at about 11:30 a.m., I was
getting ready to play soccer. I saw Father Roemer
and tried to avoid him. He pursued me and said,
"You can't get away from me." He came up behind
me and wrapped his arms around me and put his chin
on my shoulder. I started to walk away from him

409841

CCI 005341

43

and he walked with me still holding that position. He was talking to REDACTED and I pulled away from him. I was under the impression that Father Roemer's behavior was similar to that of a homosexual.

When the activities were over for that day, I went to the front of the church and waited for my ride. I was sitting on a bench when Father Roemer came up and sat very close to me. His body was touching mine and he put his arm around my shoulder. He kept his arm around me until some other boys came up and started talking to him. The kids and Father Roemer left and I was picked up shortly thereafter.

On June 20, 1981, I returned to the sports camp and ran the 50-yard dash. Father Roemer came up and said, "You run very fast." He said that he was a runner in high school and said, "Someday you can come over and look at my annual." I said, "yeah, sure," in a low voice, expressing reluctance. Father Roemer said, "See you later," and walked away. I think he knew I was reluctant.

In October 1980, I saw Father Roemer when I was signing up for flag football at Thousand Oaks High School. I hid from him, not wanting him to see me because I was afraid of him.

I saw him one time after that in January 1981 at the Westlake Theatre. He was there with a young boy and did not see me. I have not seen him since that time.

COUNT VII: REDACTED

On January 27, 1981, Detective Kelli McIlvain interviewed REDACTED 14 years, DOB: REDACTED
"REDACTED"

Detective McIlvain reported:

Above victim interviewed on tape in presence of his father, REDACTED approximately 1930 hours.

He related that he, REDACTED and REDACTED went to San Diego with suspect from December 26, 1980 to December 30, 1980, from Friday to the following Tuesday. They stayed in a Holiday Inn in a room with two double beds. The evening of December 26, 1980, REDACTED slept in one bed with suspect. The next three nights, December 27, 28,

44

29, 1980, REDACTED slept in the bed with suspect. On Saturday night, December 27, 1980, REDACTED recalls the suspect and boys laid in bed (actually REDACTED slept on the floor the whole four nights) and talked until about 0100 (December 28, 1980). This was the first time REDACTED left with suspect. As they were all talking, suspect was rubbing his chest, underarm and stomach area. About 1 a.m., they quit talking and decided to go to sleep. The suspect was still rubbing and as he began rubbing REDACTED lower stomach area, REDACTED got up out of the bed and went and laid down on the floor. The suspect got out of bed and sat on the floor next to REDACTED. Suspect asked him what was wrong. REDACTED said, "You rubbed too low." The suspect told him that he had been asleep/half asleep and he would never do anything to hurt him. That it was not his purpose or intention to do anything besides stroke his stomach. The victim, REDACTED says he believes the suspect. The suspect didn't touch him the next two nights. REDACTED said that what occurred is really nothing and he doesn't want to get the suspect in any trouble.

On February 4, 1981, District Attorney Investigator Pete Smart interviewed REDACTED CTED Investigator Smart reported:

On February 4, 1981, I interviewed REDACTED in the presence of his mother at the REDACTED residence. Deputy District Attorney REDACTED was present and participated in the interview.

REDACTED is a 9th grade student at Thousand Oaks High School. He is Catholic and attends church and CCD classes at St. Paschal's Church in Thousand Oaks. He is acquainted with Father Roemer, having been introduced to him by REDACTED at McDonald's Restaurant approximately three years ago. He has socialized with Father Roemer on several occasions. He has gone to movies with Father Roemer and on one occasion, went on an overnight trip to San Diego with him.

While attending the movie, Father Roemer would put his arm around him and would rub his bare back. REDACTED said he thought that was okay and didn't see anything wrong with Father Roemer rubbing his back.

Regarding the trip to San Diego, REDACTED related the following information:

45

1 Father Roemer called and asked me if I wanted to
2 go to San Diego. I told him that I would like to
3 go.

4 On December 26, 1980, Father Roemer REDACTED
5 REDACTED and I went to San Diego. We
6 stayed in a single room with two double beds at
7 the Holiday Inn in downtown San Diego. Father
8 Roemer paid for the room, our meals, and most of
9 the expenses while we were there.

10 The first night we were there, I slept in one of
11 the beds alone. Father Roemer and REDACTED slept in
12 the other bed and REDACTED slept on the floor. The
13 next night, I slept in bed with Father Roemer. I
14 slept in my boxer shorts and Father Roemer wore
15 pajamas.

16 Father Roemer started rubbing my back. He also
17 rubbed my stomach and chest. He was not saying
18 anything about what he was doing. I was uncom-
19 fortable and got out of bed. Father Roemer got
20 out of bed and asked me what was wrong. I told
21 him I was uncomfortable and that he had "rubbed a
22 little too low."

23 Father Roemer said he was half asleep and didn't
24 know what was going on. He apologized and said he
25 was sorry if he had annoyed me.

26 COUNT VIII: REDACTED

27 On December 27, 1980, Deputy REDACTED of the
28 Ventura County Sheriff's Department interviewed REDACTED
29 REDACTED Deputy
30 REDACTED
31 reported:

32 I responded to REDACTED
33 where I contacted victim REDACTED, a 6-year-
34 old boy. I asked REDACTED to tell me what happened
35 in his own words.

36 REDACTED said that, "Awhile" ago, he and his family
37 went camping with a church group. One night they
38 were there, he asked suspect (he calls him Father
39 Pat) to come over to his bed to say his goodnight
40 prayers. After saying the prayers, suspect reached
41 down his pajama bottoms and began feeling his
42 "penis." He said he did it for about the time it
43 takes to count to 20. During the time the suspect
44 talked about "peace." REDACTED did not say or do
45 anything during this time.

46

1 I asked REDACTED why he waited to tell what happened.
2 He said that he was afraid that he (victim) would
3 be sent to jail. He also said that suspect has
4 never done anything like this to him before, nor
5 has he since. Suspect has not talked to victim
6 about what happened. REDACTED said he had felt bad
7 since it occurred, so he finally told his mother.
8 REDACTED said he could not give any further details.

9 I talked to REDACTED REDACTED mother. She
10 relayed the following:

11 On May 10 and 11, 1980, she and her family went on
12 a religious retreat at Camp Yolijsa in the San
13 Bernardino Mountains. They went with Father
14 Patrick Roemer and other members of St. Paschal's
15 congregation, Thousand Oaks. She said that after
16 they returned, REDACTED no longer wanted to go to
17 church. He seemed to have a dramatic change in
18 attitude toward church.

19 She said that REDACTED told her about the incident on
20 December 25, 1980. She waited to report it because
21 they were out of town. She said their family is
22 very close to Father Roemer and she reported it in
23 hopes he would receive help.

24 On January 28, 1981, Detective REDACTED of the Ventura
25 County Sheriff's Department reported an interview with REDACTED
26 REDACTED

27 At the request of Lt. REDACTED I interviewed
28 above victim at his home at REDACTED in
29 REDACTED The victim stated that he and his
30 father had gone to a weekend retreat with Father
31 Roemer from St. Paschal's Church. The victim, nor
32 his father, could remember exactly when the trip
33 took place, possibly in late April or May of 1980.
34 The victim stated he was in his pajamas at approx-
35 imately 2000 hours when Father Roemer started
36 talking to him about the church and God. During
37 the conversation, Father Roemer touched the victim
38 in the groin area. According to victim, Father
39 Roemer then removed his hand and nothing more
40 happened. The victim's father was asleep in
41 another bunk in the room at the time it happened.

42 I asked victim's mother if she desired criminal
43 proceedings and she stated she was only interested
44 in seeing that Father Roemer received help for his
45 problem.

47

1 The above information was relayed to Lt. McKinley.

2 On January 5, 1981, Lt. REDACTED of the Ventura
3 County Sheriff's Office filed the following report regarding
4 action taken by him in the matter involving REDACTED
5 Lt. McKinley reported:

6 On Monday, 29 December 80, Lt. REDACTED telephoned
7 me and advised me of information contained in
8 original report. On Tuesday, 30 December 80, I
9 contacted REDACTED, Sacred Heart
10 Church, for advice on how to best handle the
11 situation, administratively.

12 On Friday, 2 January 81, I telephoned REDACTED
13 mother of victim and arranged for REDACTED to
14 further interview victim on that date.

15 REDACTED told me that she and her son had
16 spoken to REDACTED Father Roemer's superior,
17 and informed him of the incident, who assured them
18 the incident would be thoroughly handled. Det.
19 REDACTED evaluation of the victim was that he was
20 probably truthful about the incident.

21 As the incident occurred more than seven months
22 ago in another jurisdiction (San Berdo) and a copy
23 of the report had been sent to SBSO for statistical
24 purposes and victim and parents desire no formal
25 prosecution and they have brought the incident to
26 the superior of suspect, presumably competent
27 authority, no further action is warranted by this
28 department. Case closed.

On February 4, 1981, District Attorney Investigator
Pete Smart interviewed REDACTED and her son,

REDACTED Investigator Smart reported:

On February 4 1981 at approximately 11 a.m., I
interviewed REDACTED and her son REDACTED
at the Ventura County Sheriff's East Valley Station.
Deputy District Attorney Joe Taylor was present
during the interview.

REDACTED is a 7-year-old male. He is a 2nd grade
student at Bannon Elementary School in Newbury
Park.

/////

48

REDACTED

related the following information:

I first met Father Roemer about three years ago at a CCD teachers' class at St. Paschal's Church in Thousand Oaks. At that time, I was attending a Catholic church in Newbury Park. About a year later I started attending St. Paschal's Church because of Father Roemer. He was very friendly, maybe even overly friendly, but I liked him very much.

On May 10 and 11, 1980, our family attended a family retreat in San Bernardino. We stayed in barrack-type houses. The men occupied one and the women were housed in the other. Sleeping facilities consisted of bunk-type beds, similar to military style. We stayed at the camp for two days and then returned home.

I was not aware of any unusual appearance or incident while attending the retreat. However, on December 27, 1980, REDACTED related an incident involving Father Roemer that occurred at the retreat. REDACTED said that Father Roemer had rubbed his stomach and his genitals while he was in bed and had called Father Roemer to help him say his prayers.

The incident was reported to the Sheriff's Office. I also reported the incident to Father O'Ryan who is the pastor at St. Paschal's Church. Father O'Ryan assured me the matter would be dealt with. Therefore, we decided not to pursue criminal prosecution. I have not received any feedback from REDACTED as to what action was taken regarding this incident if, in fact, anything had been done whatsoever.

REDACTED was then asked a series of questions regarding the incident that occurred at this retreat. He related the following information:

We got there (church camp) at about 9:30 or 10 p.m. We had a snack and then went to bed. We were sleeping with our clothes on in sleeping bags on bunk beds. My Dad was sleeping in a bunk across from me on the other side of the room. The lights were all turned off, except for the one in the bathroom.

I called Father Roemer and asked him a question. He came over and knelt down beside my bed. He was still dressed at that time. I asked Father Roemer a question. He started to answer the question and at the same time stuck his hand under my pants.

49

1 He held onto my penis and moved his fingers. His
 2 fingers were wrapped around my penis and he moved
 3 the lower fingers while holding it. REDACTED demon-
 4 strated with the use of a soda bottle that he had
 5 been drinking from.) He held onto my penis for
 6 about 60 seconds. He did not say anything about
 7 it. I did not say anything about it because I was
 8 "too scared to tell him to stop." He was patting
 9 me on the head at the same time he was holding
 10 my penis.

11 After about 60 seconds, Father Roemer said goodnight
 12 and left. I saw him go into the bathroom. After
 13 Father Roemer left, I laid there for about a
 14 half hour because I could not go to sleep. "I had
 15 nightmares about Father Roemer dying because he
 16 did sin."

17 The next morning someone said that I fell out of
 18 bed and Father Roemer picked me up and put me back
 19 in bed. I do not remember anything about that.

20 I thought about what Father Roemer had done to me,
 21 but I did not tell my Dad because I was too scared
 22 ~~and I did not think anyone would believe me.~~

23 I saw Father Roemer that day, but only with my Mom
 24 and Dad. Nothing else happened while we were at
 25 the camp. I saw Father Roemer at church thereafter,
 26 but he never did anything like that to me again.
 27 He always hugged and kissed me, but that is all.

28 On February 6, 1981, District Attorney Investigator
 Pete Smart talked with REDACTED by telephone.
 Investigator Smart reported:

On February 6, 1981 at approximately 1 p.m., I
 telephoned REDACTED regarding an incident
 involving her son, REDACTED

REDACTED stated she talked to Father O'Ryan on
 December 27, 1980 and again on January 30, 1981
 regarding the Father Roemer incident involving her
 son, REDACTED

REDACTED stated that Father O'Ryan appeared to
 be graterul that the matter had been brought to
 his attention. He assured her that the situation
 would be thoroughly looked into and something
 would be done about it. He gave the analogy that
 the situation "is like having a splinter in your
 thumb, if something isn't done about it, it continues
 to get worse."

409848

50

1 REDACTED stated that Father O'Ryan has never
2 discussed the matter with her since that time.
3 Therefore, she is not aware of any action taken by
4 Father O'Ryan, if, in fact, any had been taken.

5 On February 10, 1981, District Attorney Investigator
6 Pete Smart telephoned Father Colm O'Ryan, Pastor of St.
7 Paschal's Church in Thousand Oaks. Investigator Smart
8 reported:

9 On February 10, 1981 at approximately 7:50 a.m., I
10 called Father O'Ryan regarding a scheduled appointment
11 for an interview that he had cancelled.

12 Father O'Ryan stated he had consulted with legal
13 counsel who had advised him not to discuss the
14 case involving Father Roemer with the District
15 Attorney. Therefore, he felt he should follow
16 that advice.

17 I asked Father O'Ryan if he had been advised by
18 defense attorney, REDACTED Father O'Ryan
19 said he had not. He stated he had been advised by
20 a local legal counsel in the community and refused
21 to identify that person.

22 I informed Father O'Ryan it was essential that we
23 talk with him regarding Father Roemer since he is
24 Father Roemer's supervisor and obviously knowledgeable
25 about the allegations involving Father Roemer. I
26 told Father O'Ryan he would receive a subpoena in
27 the near future. Therefore, he would be required
28 to appear as a witness, without the benefit of
discussing the facts of the case with the District
Attorney.

Father O'Ryan stated he would recontact his
legal advisor and let me know if and when he
would allow an interview.

23 /////

24 /////

25 /////

26 /////

27 /////

28 /////

409849

51

ADDITIONAL VICTIMS

REDACTED

A.

On January 27, 1981, Detective McIlvain interviewed

REDACTED

REDACTED

Detective McIlvain reported:

Above victim interviewed on tape. He was brought in by parents, REDACTED and REDACTED, approximately 2010 hours, EVSO.

He said that the suspect never did anything to him. A couple of times he went on overnight trips with suspect to a ranch in Fillmore. On the first trip, he was one of six boys taken by suspect. He didn't really know the other five, but recalls one boy's name was REDACTED. On the second trip, he was one of five boys. His friend and neighbor, REDACTED, went also. He cannot remember who else went. (He and his parents could not recall the dates.) They all slept in sleeping bags on the floor in the living room. The suspect had tickled his chest and stomach area, but nothing else. After talking with victim REDACTED, I asked his parents if they would check to see if they could identify dates of Fillmore trips. One trip was during school year, prior to summer 1980. Approximately 2100 hours, I received a call from Mrs. REDACTED. She advised that the REDACTED were mistaken. Her son REDACTED had never gone on any trip with suspect. She also said she had talked with her son and the suspect had never done anything to him. She seemed upset.

On February 5, 1981, District Attorney Investigator

Pete Smart interviewed REDACTED Investigator

Smart reported:

On February 5, 1981 at approximately 9:40 a.m., I interviewed REDACTED in the presence of both of his parents at the District Attorney's Office. Deputy District Attorney Joe Taylor was present and participated in the interview.

REDACTED is a 9th grade student at Newbury Park High School. He is Catholic and attends St. Paschal's Church and CCD classes. He has known Father

52

1 Roemer since he (Roemer) came to St. Paschal's
2 parish and is very fond of him. REDACTED is also
3 active in the St. Paschal's youth program. He has
4 socialized with Father Roemer on several occasions.
5 He has attended movies and has gone on overnight
6 outings with him to Father Roemer's parents' ranch
7 in Fillmore. He has never been alone with Father
8 Roemer on any of these social outings.

9 REDACTED

10 thinks Father Roemer is a very affectionate
11 person. Father Roemer has hugged him and kissed
12 him on the forehead many times. REDACTED claims he
13 has never gone into the teachers' lounge with
14 Father Roemer. However, he has gone into his
15 office and has been shown pictures in a book.
16 While looking at the pictures, they were sitting
17 side-by-side and Father Roemer had his arm around
18 him.

19 On one occasion, REDACTED invited Father Roemer to
20 his home for a swimming party. This occurred in
21 early-August 1980. REDACTED
22 and REDACTED were also present. Mr. & Mrs.
23 REDACTED were not at home; however, were aware of
24 the party and gave their approval.

25 During the course of the party, Father Roemer
26 "tickled" REDACTED in the rib area. REDACTED denies
27 that Father Roemer had ever rubbed his stomach
28 and/or chest.

REDACTED

has also gone to the movies and on overnight
outings to Father Roemer's ranch in Fillmore. At
the movie, Father Roemer would sit between REDACTED
and one of the other boys who were present. Father
Roemer would put his arm around him and occasionally
tickle his knee. He did not attempt to rub his
back or other parts of his body.

REDACTED

and several boys were invited by Father
Roemer to spend the night at his parents' ranch in
Fillmore. They arrived at the ranch at approx-
imately 4:30 or 5 p.m. They went for a walk, ate,
and then sat around the living room telling ghost
stories. Father Roemer had his arm around someone
all of the time.

At approximately 10 or 11 p.m., they decided to
turn in for the night. They all slept in sleeping
bags on the floor, except Father Roemer. He slept
on the couch. Everyone slept in pajamas. They
changed into their pajamas in the bedroom, out of
the presence of Father Roemer and each other.

/////

53

REDACTED

denied that Father Roemer had touched or rubbed him while they were at the ranch. He did not observe Father Roemer touching or rubbing any of the others present. There were no unusual or remarkable occurrences while at the ranch. The following morning they got up around 8 a.m. and returned home.

REDACTED said that Father Roemer is a very affectionate person and has hugged him, kissed him on the forehead and tickled him. However, he has not attempted to rub his stomach or chest. REDACTED said that REDACTED is also affectionate, but he doesn't tickle. REDACTED denies being aware of Father Roemer shaking or shivering during any of the aforementioned contacts with him.

REDACTED

B.

Detective Kelli McIlvain of the Ventura County Sheriff's Department interviewed REDACTED 14 years, DOB: REDACTED Detective

McIlvain reported:

Above victim interviewed in presence of his father, REDACTED, in EVSO on tape.

He related the suspect had never done anything to him. He did go on an overnight trip to the ranch once. Neither he nor his father could recall the date. They did sleep in sleeping bags on the living room floor and the suspect slept next to him in a sleeping bag, but he could not recall suspect touching him.

REDACTED

C.

On January 27, 1981, Sergeant Jack Hughes of the Ventura County Sheriff's Department interviewed REDACTED 14 years, DOB: REDACTED

REDACTED Sergeant REDACTED reported:

REDACTED interview 1/27/81. 1915 hours. I recorded the interview with REDACTED with his father and mother present.

/////

409852

54

He told me he went to San Diego with Father Roemer the Friday after Christmas. They left on December 26, and stayed five days and four nights at the Holiday Inn in San Diego, Room 1003. He said two other boys went along, REDACTED and (unknown last name). They stayed in a single room which had two double beds. The first night, the night of December 26, 1980, he slept with Father Roemer. REDACTED slept on the floor and REDACTED slept in the other bed alone. He only slept the one night in the same bed with Father Roemer. He said he did not know if anything had happened as far as Father Roemer touching him anywhere. He is a sound sleeper, REDACTED which his mother confirmed. His mother said that REDACTED is very hard to wake up. There was no reason he did not sleep in the same bed as Father Roemer. He just fell asleep on the floor watching TV. He told me he is fond of Father Roemer, but would tell me if he remembered anything happening.

D. FREDDIE ALVAREZ

Deputy William Montijo of the Ventura Sheriff's Department, on February 12, 1981, attempted to interview REDACTED and made the following report:

At approx. 1930 hours, I drove to REDACTED in an effort to interview REDACTED a victim in this investigation. REDACTED victim's step-father, met me outside of the house and I explained my purpose. REDACTED told me his son was not home, that he was in L.A. and would be returning the following day some time around 6 p.m. I explained to REDACTED that it was important I obtain a stmt. from victim. REDACTED related he had talked with his son about Father Roemer and he told me his son told him nothing had happened. I made an appointment to attempt contact with victim btwn. 1900-2100 hours on 2/13/81.

2/13/81:

At approx. 1930 hours, I drove to the REDACTED residence and again was met by REDACTED his wife, and two other adults outside of the residence. REDACTED related his son had not yet returned from L.A. I again told REDACTED it was important we spoke with his son. I told REDACTED we could contact his son at Colina School or at a later time. REDACTED questioned me regarding the case. I told REDACTED

55

1 that the "S" had admitted touching his son.
 2 REDACTED asked me if questioning his son could
 3 wait until his court appearance. I explained
 4 it was necessary to interview his son prior to
 5 court. I asked REDACTED if his son was home and
 6 he just did not want me to talk to him. He said
 7 that his son was not home. REDACTED seemed to be
 8 evasive about his son's whereabouts and I felt his
 9 son was possibly in the residence. I was of the
 10 impression by REDACTED conduct that he really did
 11 not want his son involved with Roemer's case and
 12 was sympathetic towards his plight.

13 No further effort to interview REDACTED by this
 14 officer.

15 REDACTED

16 E.

17 On February 2, 1981, Detective Kelli McIlvain of the
 18 Ventura County Sheriff's Office submitted the following
 19 report:

20 This date I talked with REDACTED
 21 Director, of Special Education and Special Services,
 22 Conejo Valley Unified School District, 1400 East
 23 Janss Road, Thousand Oaks, 497-9511.

24 He related in late October or early November 1980,
 25 a previous student, REDACTED
 26 told his mother that suspect, after a church-
 27 related class, had rubbed his stomach and chest.
 28 The suspect shook all over during this action.
 REDACTED told REDACTED (Acacia School),
 REDACTED teacher at the time. REDACTED was
 advised to phone the Ventura Sheriff's Department
 with this info.

29 The possible victim now lives at REDACTED
 30 REDACTED and attends Poindexter
 31 School.

32 Approximately 1600 hours, this date, Sgt. A.
 33 REDACTED and I attempted to contact victim at his
 34 residence. REDACTED talked with REDACTED
 35 (victim's Dad) who said he would have his wife
 36 contact us if she had any information.

37 On February 17, 1981, Detective REDACTED Ventura
 38 County Sheriff's Department, interviewed REDACTED
 39 REDACTED Mrs. REDACTED is a special

56

1 education teacher at Acacia School, REDACTED
2 REDACTED

3 Detective McIlvain reported:

4 Mrs. REDACTED related that in September 1980, Mrs.
5 REDACTED mother of student REDACTED told her the
6 following: Father Roemer, after either CCD or
7 class or altar boy class, had put his hand inside
8 REDACTED shirt and stroked his stomach. While doing
9 this, Father Roemer began to tremble all over.

10 Mrs. REDACTED thinks this occurrence was in June of
11 1980. After learning of this in September, she
12 immediately gave the information to her supervisor,
13 REDACTED and then to REDACTED Director of
14 Special Education of Conejo Valley Unified School
15 District. (Prior to REDACTED) At a later
16 date, she gave the information to REDACTED
17 She recalls she went to REDACTED because Father
18 Roemer was on Acacia School campus talking and
19 visiting with students about once a week. It was
20 Father Roemer's practice for at least school year
21 79-80 and 80-81 (to time of arrest) to come to
22 Acacia School during the lunch hour on Mondays.
23 Mrs. REDACTED knew of no formal purpose/reason for
24 his visits. She recalls that after her discussion
25 with Mrs. REDACTED Father Roemer quit coming to
26 her class table in the cafeteria as he had done in
27 the past. He stopped visiting as much with REDACTED
28 REDACTED Mrs. REDACTED said that another student of
hers, REDACTED 11 or 12 years, had told her
that Father Roemer was his "favorite rabbi" because
Father Roemer had kissed him on the cheek. REDACTED
later told her that Father Roemer had invited him
to his home. REDACTED does not think REDACTED
visited Father Roemer at his residence because the
newspaper article of his arrest was printed shortly
after her talk with REDACTED

21 She learned that Father Roemer was often on Glenwood
22 Elementary School campus and had filled out some
23 sort of on-campus application for Redwood School.
24 Mrs. REDACTED did not know if he had ever filled out
25 any similar application for Acacia School in the
26 past. She knew of no other person who was routinely
27 on Acacia campus without a formal purpose.

26 WHEREFORE, The People of the State of California
27 respectfully submit this Statement of Facts as proof of the
28 factual basis of the pleas of nolo contendere by Donald Patrick

57

1- Roemer to three counts of violation of section 288(a) of the
2 Penal Code (Counts I, II, and III of the Information).

3 DATED:

4 Respectfully submitted,
5 MICHAEL D. BRADBURY, District Attorney
6 County of Ventura, State of California

7
8 By JOSEPH E. TAYLOR, JR.
9 Deputy District Attorney

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
jo

409856

58

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

EXHIBIT "A"

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

409857

CCI 005357

59

1 INTERVIEW OF DONALD P. ROEMER BY KELLI MC ILVAIN,

2
3 DR = Donald Roemer

4 KM = Kelli McIlvain

5
6 (unintelligible)

7 KM: And your date of birth.

8 DR: 17-44.

9 KM: And your residence address?

10 DR: REDACTED

11 KM: Do you have your own phone there?

12 DR: Yes. Well, there's a _____

13 KM: Okay. Is the house phone kinda like your work phone?

14 DR: That's a work phone.

15 KM: And what's your --

16 DR: 495-871__

17 KM: I'd like to talk to you about the information _____ I have
18 to read you your rights. Because at this point you are
19 a suspect in the crime of child molest. Okay?

20 DR: Okay.

21 KM: You understand that you're suspected of committing the
22 crime of child molest. Do you understand?

23 DR: Uh-huh.

24 KM: You have the right to remain silent. Do you understand?

25 DR: Uh-huh.

26 KM: If you give up that right, anything you say can and will
27 be used against you in a court of law. Do you understand?
28 You have the right to talk to a lawyer and have him

60

1- you understand?

2 DR:

3 KM: If you cannot afford to hire a lawyer, one will be

4 appointed to represent you before any questioning at no

5 cost to you if you wish one. Do you understand?

6 DR:

7 KM: Do you understand all these rights that I've explained

8 to you? Do you have any questions about these rights?

9 DR: No, I don't think so.

10 KM: Having these rights in mind, do you wish to give up these

11 rights and talk to me about the charges against you?

12 DR: I'd rather talk to you.

13 KM: You would?

14 DR: Uh-huh.

15 KM: Okay. Do you know a boy by the name of REDACTED

16 DR: Yes.

17 KM: Did you see REDACTED Today?

18 DR: Yes, I saw him today.

19 KM: What time did you see him?

20 DR: Saw him when he got there for his religious instruction

21 class. I forget the exact, probably about 3:20 to 3:25.

22 KM: What did you say to REDACTED

23 DR: What did I say to him?

24 KM: Uh-huh.

25 DR: I asked him--I'm just going to tell you.

26 KM: Okay.

27 DR: I have no problem.

28 KM: Okay.

409859

CCI 005359

61

1 DR: No problem. Because, well -- it, it is a problem, it isn't --
2 maybe it's the best way for it to come out.
3 KM: Uh-huh.
4 DR: I mean, I've dealt with it before on a spiritual basis
5 and it never works and I am having a problem, not
6 that I'm going around molesting children and
7 stuff like that. I'll just tell you exactly what happened,
8 probably exactly what he said.
9 KM: Okay.
10 DR: Can I ask you what he said?
11 KM: He said that ah you asked him to come into an office and
12 look at some pictures --
13 DR: Yeah. My year book.
14 KM: Okay.
15 DR: My year book.
16 KM: Your year book pictures and he said that you had him sit
17 on your lap.
18 DR: Uh-huh.
19 KM: Is that right?
20 DR: And I had him stand up.
21 KM: And you had him stand up? Where did you have him stand up?
22 DR: Just right in front of me. I mean, not expose himself, I,
23 I touched him.
24 KM: Did you touch his penis?
25 DR: Yeah.
26 KM: Did you --
27 DR: Not all the way, but I --
28 KM: Did you stroke his penis?

62

1 DR: Well, kinda, just kinda back and forth, but I never really
2 grabbed it or touched it all the way.

3 KM: Did, did you do this while he was sitting on your lap?

4 DR: No, while he was standing.

5 KM: What did you say to him when you were doing this?

6 DR: Well, I started out by stroking his stomach and asking
7 him if that felt good --

8 KM: Uh-huh.

9 DR: -- and I he said yes and I just went further. He didn't
10 say anything but yes and he was paging through the book.

11 KM: This was when he was standing up?

12 DR: Well, yeah, he was, he was sitting in my lap first and then
13 I asked him to stand up and --

14 KM: Okay. So then you ah, put your hand under his shirt and
15 stroked his stomach--

16 DR: At first.

17 KM: --at first, and then did you--was he sitting on your lap
18 when you were stroking his penis?

19 DR: I think I did it first when he was, when he was standing
20 up and when he sat down again I did it for a short time,
21 just a few seconds and that was it.

22 KM: So you, you had him sit down, stand up, sit down, is that
23 right?

24 DR: Well, when he first came in he stood up, but then he sat down
25 in my lap, looked at the pictures. That's when I started
26 it--

27 KM: Uh-huh.

28 DR: He stood up, then he sat down.

63

1 KM: Okay. Did you tell him to stand up?
2 DR: Yeah.
3 KM: Why did you tell him to stand up?
4 DR: So it would be easier or me to get my hand down there.
5 KM: How long do you think, how long do you think this whole
6 incident took?
7 DR: About a minute and a half, two minutes. It really wasn't
8 long.
9 KM: Ah,
10 DR: I know this is hard for you; it's hard for me.
11 KM: I'm sure it is, Father. Have you already told REDACTED
12 REDACTED is it?
13 DR: REDACTED really isn't the pastor anymore. REDACTED
14 REDACTED is.
15 KM: Have you already told REDACTED ?
16 DR: I will.
17 KM: How did REDACTED already know about it when I called?
18 DR: About what?
19 KM: About ah, a 7-year-old, a young boy making an accusation,
20 do you know?
21 DR: REDACTED knew about it?
22 KM: Yeah. I called and talked with you, and you must have
23 got my message because you--
24 DR: Oh, I, I got your message.
25 KM: And the Father asked me is this concerning a young boy
26 and I said that I only would talk with you.
27 DR: It could be that the parents had called and talked to him.
28 KM: No, they didn't. I've already talked with them. Maybe

409862

64

1 somebody else, or they talked Maybe--

2 DR: How could he have possibly known?

3 KM: Somebody else must have called. This only happened today.

4 DR: Yes.

5 KM: Is it alright if I have a cigarette?

6 DR: Sure.

7 KM: Okay, they have another boy who's name is REDACTED

8 DR: Yes.

9 KM: He told me something that happened during confession.

10 Would you know what that would be?

11 DR: Uh-huh.

12 KM: What was that then?

13 DR: He came in and sat on my lap for confession, I put my

14 hand under his shirt. I didn't, you know, molest him or

15 anything like that.

16 KM: When ah, when-REDACTED was in your office, did you kiss hi

17 on the ear?

18 DR: Can't remember.

19 That's the truth, I don't--

20 KM: You don't remember?

21 DR: I don't remember.

22 KM: Do you think you could have?

23 DR: I could have.

24 KM: He also said that when you were stroking his penis and he

25 was sitting on your lap, you were shaking.

26 DR: Uh-huh.

27 KM: Is that true?

28 DR: Yes.

CCI 005364

66

1 KM: Have you ever been arrested for anything prior to this?
2 DR: No.
3 KM: How long have you been a Father?
4 DR: 11 years.
5 KM: 11 years.
6 DR: Please be patient. This is painful.
7 KM: I know and I appreciate how hard it must be. Nobody, I'm
8 sure, but you, can know how terribly hard it is.
9 DR: Last year I got the, because of interest in working with
10 kids and it's not just motivated by the problem, last year
11 I got the honorary service award from the National PTA for
12 working with kids. What a farce now --
13 KM: Can you give me an estimate of how many times in the past
14 this has happened, fondling the genitals?
15 DR: I don't know. Two, two times before.
16 KM: And how long ago has this been?
17 DR: It's been within this year.
18 KM: This year? All, January of this year?
19 DR: I don't think January.
20 KM: 1981?
21 DR: Yeah.
22 KM: It's been since Christmas?
23 DR: Well, there was one occasion, right after -- I'm not trying
24 to elude you. I'm just, I don't really know when exactly
25 it was.
26 KM: Ah, other than fondling with your hand -- the other two
27 incidents, was there any type of sexual activity?
28 DR: No.

409865

67

1 KM: Okay. Have you had very many boys sit on your lap during
2 confession and rub their chests?
3 DR: Besides ^{REDACTED} brother, I don't know --
4 KM: Do you think that's appropriate behavior, Father?
5 DR: No, I know it's not appropriate. I, I--
6 KM: I understand that you realize what you did was
7 wrong, but I've got the feeling, from what you said before, --
8 DR: No, I don't, I'm not trying to cover up or anything --
9 KM: It's not as overt as what happened with ^{REDACTED} but --
10 DR: Yeah.
11 KM: -- but it's still inappropriate--
12 DR: Yeah, it most certainly is. I have not nearly enough
13 sought out, I think, enough pshchological help for the
14 problem I have. (pause) Like, even after it happened, I
15 think I knew, I really did know --
16 KM: You knew what?
17 DR: That I was I just felt it, I
18 mean, it's not like I haven't told anybody before.
19 KM: Have you told people before?
20 DR: Not people, but this priest that's up in Santa Barbara.
21 KM: Yeah. But you've--have you told anyone else?
22 DR: No.
23 KM: Do you know the names of the other two boys?
24 DR: Ah -- there is one, well there's one kid that sat on my
25 lap in confession and I did it -- REDACTED
26 KM: And how long ago do you think that was?
27 DR: Not long, I think it was two weeks ago.
28 KM: You know how to spell it?

409866

68

1 DR: REDACTED
2 KM: How old is REDACTED
3 DR: I think REDACTED; 7-1/2.
4 KM: Was he already going to confession?
5 DR: I think he made his first one, but I didn't do it in
6 confession.
7 KM: When did it happen?
8 DR: That was in, in that same room--it's not my office, it's
9 the teachers' lounge. That is in the center of the school.
10 KM: Now would that have been the 12th, Monday the 12th? It
11 would be two weeks ago today.
12 DR: I think, I think that would be _____
13 KM: Was, is he going to CCD? Wouldn't that be about the same
14 thing?
15 DR: It was Monday. You're just talking about in general, not
16 genital?
17 KM: You didn't rub his genitals that time?
18 DR: No. I didn't rub his at all.
19 KM: did you rub his stomach?
20 DR: Yes. And his chest.
21 KM: _____ touch his skin --
22 DR: Uh-huh.
23 KM: Did you show him your year book that time?
24 DR: No.
25 KM: How long did this--ah, how long was it?
26 DR: About 2 minutes.
27 KM: Was this about 3:30?
28 DR: Ah, around 3:30.

409867

69

1 KM: And besides ^{REDACTED} the other incident?

2 DR: One other -- ^{REDACTED} He's a 6th grader. And that

3 was the same day -- I don't think that was on the same

4 day. I can't remember exactly when that happened, I think

5 it was last week, last Monday. He spells it ^{REDACTED}

6 KM: He's in 6th grade, so he's 11 or 12?

7 DR: Uh-huh.

8 KM: And you think this was last Monday?

9 DR: Uh-huh.

10 KM: Which ^{be} the same day ^{REDACTED} went to confession and this

11 happened.

12 DR: Ah, ^{REDACTED} ah ^{REDACTED} went to confession -- Okay, when he went

13 to confession was not on a Monday, it was his day for CCD.

14 Yes it is, he comes--he was sick today. So, it was the

15 same--it was the same, think it was--the same day.

16 KM: He was sick today?

17 DR: Yeah. His brother was not there.

18 KM: Okay. So, so it was on the same day with ^{REDACTED} Did

19 this happen in the confessional?

20 DR: No.

21 KM: Where did it happen?

22 DR: In the room.

23 KM: In the, ah, the same room we were talking about previously?

24 DR: Yes.

25 KM: Did you have the 6th grader sit on your lap?

26 DR: No. He sat in a chair next to me.

27 KM: And this wasn't during confession?

28 DR: No.

70

1 KM: How did you have him come into the office?

2 DR: As soon as he got there. It was previous--confess--the

3 confession time wasn't Saturday. It was, it was a special

4 time that REDACTED and I have the penance service

5 and they can go to confession if they want. So, that was

6 after 4 o'clock. I don't know the precise time, but this

7 is before CCD... It starts at 3:30.

8 KM: REDACTED

9 DR: REDACTED

10 KM: Well, was he in that office for a prepenance conference?

11 DR: No.

12 KM: What was he in the office for?

13 DR: I asked him to come in there.

14 KM: Why did you, did you ask him to come in to look at

15 anything or for what reason?

16 DR: I jus--he's in a special class at school.

17 KM: Uh-huh.

18 DR: Not at our school, but at Acacia and I asked him to come

19 in to see how he was doing because I didn't see him at

20 lunch that day when I was there.

21 KM: What did you say to him, while you were rubbing his chest?

22 DR: I just asked him how things were going, just had like a

23 general conversation.

24 KM: You were jus--and you were rubbing his chest while you

25 were having a general conversation?

26 DR: Uh-huh, yes.

27 KM: Well, did he seem alarmed?

28 DR: No. You're asking me for a fact.

409869

CCI 005369

71

1 KM: Yeah. Yeah, I know.
2 DR:
3 KM: Well, that's right.
4 DR: I know what I'm doing is -- wrong.
5 KM: I'm just trying to see--you're sitting side-by-side--
6 DR: And I reached over like this.
7 (pause)
8 KM: Rubbing his chest.
9 DR: Yeah.
10 KM: Did you have an erection when you were doing this?
11 DR: Yes.
12 KM: Did you have an erection when you were doing this to ah,
13 REDACTED
14 DR: Yes.
15 KM: Did you ejaculate?
16 DR: Ah, yes.
17 KM: Did you ejaculate while rubbing the chest?
18 DR: Ah, I can't remember.
19 KM: Okay. Do you remember if you ejaculated after rubbing
20 REDACTED
21 DR: Ah, today you mean?
22 KM: No ^{REDACTED} wasn't -- today.
23 DR: Oh, that's right, ah no. That was different.
24 KM: But you had an erection when, you -- with ^{REDACTED}
25 DR: Uh-huh.
26 KM: And you had an erection when you were with ^{REDACTED}
27 (pause)
28 DR: Yes.

409870

72

1 KM: Have you ever done anything like this with any little
2 girls?
3 DR: No.
4 KM: Well, it was 2 weeks ago with REDACTED a week ago with
5 REDACTED and REDACTED and today with REDACTED Is there anything else,
6 Father, is there anything else that will come to light,
7 that you think you should talk about now?
8 DR: Yeah.
9 KM: What is that?
10 DR: Everything I tell you has to go down?
11 KM: It does, Father.
12 DR: Probably be made public too?
13 KM: The ah--
14 DR: You don't have to answer that.
15 KM: The details of this, I won't make public. It will be
16 public information that you've been arrested.
17 DR: What does that mean?
18 KM: Well, whoever is arrested -- that's public information,
19 just point of fact -- that's what it is, public information,
20 but I won't be talking to the press, myself, about
21 details of the case. And I know that that is very
22 frightening from your position right now. But the real
23 point is this activity is wrong -- it's gotta be stopped.
24 That's the important part.
25 DR: Right.
26 KM:
27 DR: I understand. I -- but, like how it's stopped --
28 KM: Yeah. Important too.

409871

73

1 DR: What, what kind of help can I get, if any at all?

2 KM: What kind of psychiatric help?

3 DR: Is that part of the procedure?

4 KM: It is part of the procedure, you will be ah, evaluated
5 by psychiatrists and I, I really don't know what kind
6 of help they will give you. I know it is essential you're
7 motivated to be helped.

8 DR: Yeah. There's no doubt about it, it's kind of like trying
9 and trying and trying not to get involved in that, failing
10 over and over again and not knowing what to do.

11 KM: Fighting it and fighting it.

12 DR: Fighting it and not knowing how to handle it anymore.
13 Fooling yourself that the more you go and talk to a
14 spiritual leader it's gonna do, and letting it go, you
15 know?

16 KM: There are special psychiatrists for this kind of problem
17 that specialize in this area. Ah, I don't, I can't tell
18 you what, what the courts will do about this. I can't
19 say no, they'll just put you, you know, in a psychiatric
20 program, I really can't tell you, cause I don't know what
21 the sentencing will be.

22 DR: Can I just ask you some questions? I mean just --

23 KM: Sure, go ahead.

24 DR: It'll obviously be all over town. I mean, just tell me.

25 KM: I think that the people in your church have a great
26 respect for all the work you've done and I think that
27 from investigations in the past, you will have some
28 friends that will stick by you and will help you
through this time and ah, I've already heard that

74

1 you have done excellent work with the youth in the church.

2 DR: That's all shot.

3 KM: Well, people understand that, if the work was done, it was
4 accomplished and you've done it, so I wouldn't say it's
5 all shot. People that care about you are going to
6 be most concerned of handle the whole thing. We both
7 know, there are times when it takes a great deal more courage
8 to tell the truth than it does to lie.

9 DR: I know it. I know.

10 KM: People make mistakes.

11 DR: I'm gonna trust _____, maybe it's for the best.
12 Where do I go from here?

13 KM: Well, I'm going to have to arrest you.

14 DR: Fine. I mean, like do all the rest of those people have
15 to be contacted?

16 KM: They should be contacted. They will be contacted, Father.
17 The parents of ^{REDACTED} and ^{REDACTED} are very upset, naturally,
18 but they also expressed a lot of concern about what would
19 happen to you.

20 DR: That's great.

21 KM: Is there anything else that I'm going to find out?

22 DR: Yeah.

23 KM: Okay

24

25

26

27

28

409873

75

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF VENTURA

 DA ☒ D.C.S. ☒
 PO ☐ OTHER ☐
 SO ☐

 JUDGE: ROBERT L. SHAW
 CLERK: DEBORA KUSCH
 DDA: JOE TAYLOR
 DPO: JOSEPH KITKO

DATE: 03-10-81

TIME: 9:00 a.m. DEPT: 17

BAILIFF: R. WILKERSON CRT RPTR: EDWARD OREB

DEF CNSL: REDACTED

TITLE OF CAUSE:

CASE NO: CR 16350

 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 VS
NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS:

DONALD PATRICK ROEMER

PLEA NOLO CONTENDERE

Case Category: Criminal

The District Attorney files an Information against the above named defendant, charging said defendant with the crime(s) of violation of Section(s) 288(a) of the Penal Code as set forth in Counts 1 through 5 and Count 8; 647a of the Penal Code, a misdemeanor, as set forth in Counts 6 and 7.

The defendant is served with a copy of the above named document and states that his/her name is as indicated.

The defendant waives formal arraignment and recitation of rights.

The defendant is duly arraigned for plea.

The defendant pleads NOLO CONTENDERE of the offense of lead and lascivious acts with a person under the age of 14 years, a violation of Section 288(a) of the Penal Code as set forth in Counts I, II and III of the Information.

Respective counsel stipulate that the court may read and consider the statement of facts submitted by the People for making the finding that there is a factual basis for the entry of the plea.

The court finds, after examination, that the defendant is represented by capable and experienced counsel; that the defendant has been advised of and understands his/her constitutional rights and the nature of the plea, together with all possible terms of punishment and commitment; that the defendant understandingly and voluntarily enters said plea; that the defendant knowingly waives his/her constitutional right to remain silent, to a trial by court or jury, and to confront witnesses; and that there is a factual basis for the plea entered.

Defendant applies for probation, and the matter is referred to the Probation Office for investigation, report and recommendation. Hearing on defendant's application for probation, and/or the pronouncement of judgment is set on calendar on April 14, 1981 at 9:00 a.m. in Department 17.

Defendant waives any question of time to said date.

Defendant's bail or own recognizance agreement is continued, and the defendant is ordered to report forthwith to the Probation Office for an initial interview, to keep all subsequent appointments, and to return into court on the date and time stated herein.

ROBERT L. HAMM, County Clerk

By:

Deputy County Clerk

MEO

MINUTES

76

MICHAEL D. BRADBURY
District Attorney
Hall of Justice
800 South Victoria Avenue
Ventura, CA 93009

Telephone (805) 654-2500

Attorney for Plaintiff

FILED

DATE: MAR 10 1981
ROBERT L. HAMM, County Clerk
By: *[Signature]*
Deputy County Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF VENTURA

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff,

VS.

DONALD PATRICK ROEMER

Defendant.

COURT NO. **CR 16350**
FELONY DISPOSITION AGREEMENT
(Penal Code § 1192.5)

I.

PLEA

A. CHANGE OF PLEA

The defendant will plead GUILTY () NOLO CONTENDERE (X) to:
Counts I, II, and III, each alleging a separate violation of Section
288(a) of the Penal Code and admit.
The remaining counts and allegations and the charges contained
in case number **CR 16350** will be dismissed after the defen-
dant is sentenced.

B. NOLO CONTENDERE PLEA (Defendant to initial, if applicable)

✓ *DPR* I understand that my plea of nolo contendere (no contest) has
the same effect as a guilty plea in that it constitutes a con-
viction and allows for the same punishment.

C. VOLUNTARINESS OF PLEA (Defendant to initial)

✓ *DPR* I am entering this plea voluntarily and not as the result of any
force, pressure, threats or coercion brought against me or any
member of my family; further, no promises have been made other
than those appearing on this form.

409875

77

D. FACTUAL BASIS FOR PLEA (Defendant to initial)

✓ DPF I have discussed the facts of the case against me and all possible defenses which I might have with my attorney.

✓ DPF I agree the Court may receive and consider the ~~explanatory~~ ~~Statement of Facts submitted by the People of the State of California~~ ~~as proof of the factual basis of the plea of no 1a contendre to the~~ ~~three counts of violating Section 288(a) of the Penal Code.~~

E. CONSEQUENCES OF PLEA (Defendant to initial)

✓ DPF My attorney has explained to me the direct and indirect consequences of this plea including the maximum possible sentence. I understand that the following consequences could result from my plea:

(✓ applicable spaces)

✓ DPF The maximum possible term in state prison is 10 1/3 year(s).

✓ DPF Registration as a sexual offender pursuant to Penal Code section 290.

— Deportation, exclusion or denial of naturalization if I am an alien. (Penal Code section 1016.5)

✓ DPF Commitment as a Mentally Disordered Sex Offender.

— Commitment to the California Youth Authority.

— Registration as a narcotics offender.

F. WAIVER OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS (Defendant to initial)

✓ DPF My attorney has explained to me and I understand that this plea will result in my conviction and that I therefore am waiving (giving up) each of the following constitutional rights:

1. The right to have every charge and allegation against me determined by a jury of 12 persons;
2. The right to confront and through my attorney, cross-examine each witness called by the prosecution to prove my guilt;
3. The right to be represented at all times during a trial by a competent attorney and to have the Court appoint one to represent me at no charge if I can't afford one;
4. The right against self-incrimination which means I would not have to testify at my trial and if I didn't the jury could not consider this as evidence of guilt.

78

II. SENTENCE

A. The District Attorney's Position is: (Deputy District Attorney to initial)

PR 92/10 No sentence commitments.

The defendant shall not now be committed to state prison. The defendant may at a later time be committed to state prison if a court finds he has violated probation.

The offense(s) shall be declared or made a misdemeanor.

The defendant shall receive credit for time served.

B. The Court's Commitments, if any, are:

C. Harvey waiver: (Defendant to initial)

✓ DRR The defendant agrees that as to all counts, priors and enhancements that are dismissed, information pertaining to such counts, priors, and enhancements may be included in the probation report and considered by the Court in determining sentence.

III.

DEFENDANT'S AND DEFENSE ATTORNEY'S AGREEMENT

I have read, discussed with my attorney, and understand each item on this form and have initialed each section to so indicate; I request the Court to accept this plea.

✓ DATED:

March 3, 1981

Donald Patrick Rosen
(Defendant's signature)

I have explained to the defendant all of his constitutional rights and I am satisfied he understands them and also understands that by entering this plea he is giving up each of them. I have discussed the facts of the case and all possible defenses to the charges with the defendant. I have explained the direct and indirect consequences of this plea to the defendant and am satisfied he understands them. I am satisfied the defendant is voluntarily and of his own free will seeking to enter this plea. I request the Court to accept this plea.

REDACTED

✓ DATED:

March 3, 1981

409877

79

IV.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S AGREEMENT

With the exception of any commitments made by the court, I agree to the terms of this plea and request that the Court accept it and order this agreement filed.

MICHAEL D. BRADBURY, District Attorney
County of Ventura, State of California

DATED:

March 19, 1981

By

Joseph C. Taylor, Jr.
Deputy District Attorney

ORDER

The defendant's plea is conditionally accepted pursuant to the provisions of Penal Code section 1192.5, and the clerk is ordered to file this agreement.

SO ORDERED.

DATED:

Judge of the Superior Court

409878

80

Selected Documentation from the Secular Media

409879

81

Tuesday

Ventura County

Star☆Free Press


One Hundred and Sixty Year, No. 116

March 3, 1981

Two Sections

20 Pages

20 Cents



Municipal Court Judge Burt Henson allowed cameras into the courtroom this morning for a hearing involving the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer of Thousand Oaks, second husband of the defendant, standing with him is Oxnard attorney Bruce Mayfield.

Photo by Ray...

Priest to plead no contest to child molesting

By Gregg Zoroya

VENTURA STAR
FRIE PNTS

March 3, 1981

A Thousand Oaks priest said this morning he will plead no contest which is the same as a guilty plea in a criminal case, to felony charges of molesting three children.

The Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer 36, priest at St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church, said he would make the plea in exchange for district attorney's officials dropping five other child molestation charges against him.

The agreement between Roemer and the District Attorney's Office was revealed during a court appearance before Municipal Court Judge Burton M. Henson.

The appearance was to be a preliminary hearing, but a stipulation to waive the preliminary hearing was presented to Henson. The waiver was conditioned on an agreement by Roemer to plead no contest.

Henson ordered Roemer to appear for arraignment in Superior Court Friday. Any plea agreement would normally be entered at that time.

If Roemer pleads no contest, he could face a maximum of 10½ years in prison for the crimes.

The expressionless priest hustled his way through a dozen newspaper, radio and television reporters without acknowledging any of the questions directed to him.

"We don't have any comments, no comments at all," Oxnard attorney Bruce Mayfield said while escorting his client out of the building.

The priest was arrested Jan. 26 by sheriff's deputies on suspicion of making "advances of a sexual nature" to a child during a catechism class.

The original complaint accused Roemer of molesting nine boys on separate occasions last year and this year. Two of the molestations occurred outside Ventura County but were initiated in this county, the district attorney charges.

The ages of the victims range from 6 to 15. The three felony cases to which Roemer indicated he would plead no contest occurred in January, said Deputy District Attorney Joe Taylor.

As a result of the agreement and a prior decision by district attorney officials, five counts, including two misdemeanor counts, will be dropped. A sixth count was going to be dismissed anyway, Taylor said.

The families of the nine victims were informed Monday that they would not have to appear at the preliminary hearing, Taylor said, indicating that the agreement had been tentatively reached that day.

Roemer remains free on a written promise to appear in court.

83

Thousand Oaks priest admits he molested 3 boys

3/10/81

By Gregg Zoroya

The Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer, 36-year-old Catholic priest at a large Thousand Oaks church, admitted in court this morning that he molested three young boys who attend the church. And evidence submitted in court by the District Attorney's Office detailed how Roemer fondled one young boy while in the lounge of St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church in Thousand Oaks, where Roemer was a priest. It also described one incident when Roemer hugged and kissed a young boy while in the confession-

al. Dressed in a light blue leisure jacket and dark pants, the short, fair-complexioned Roemer entered pleas of no contest to three counts of child molesting before Superior Court Judge Robert L. Shaw.

Standing with hands folded in front of him, the priest answered "Yes" quietly to each of several questions put to him by Deputy District attorney Joe Taylor.

"Yes. Yes, I am. I understand that," the priest answered as Taylor asked him if Roemer understood no contest.

The District Attorney's Office released the same statement of fact to the press minutes after Roemer's court appearance this morning.

In it was evidence from a 60-minute interview with the priest by authorities, wherein Roemer said that allegations by a 7-year-old boy were true. Roemer admitted asking the boy into the teachers' lounge on church grounds, where he sexually molested the child.

the charges, whether he realized that a plea of no contest carried the same implications as a plea of guilty in a criminal trial, and whether Roemer understood he could be sentenced to 10 1/2 years in prison for the crime.

Taylor also told the priest he would be registered as a sex offender.

Shaw set sentencing for April 14 at 9 a.m. A probation report should be completed at that time and admitted there were 10 other boys who were interviewed about their experience with the priest. "Suspect (Roemer) said he has been struggling with feelings of a homosexual nature since he was young and sought assistance while assigned to a parish in San Barbara through a church psychologist," the district attorney's written statement says.

Roemer's arrest provoked an uproar among members of St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church, who felt Roemer was being publicly vilified. When Roemer was arraigned in Municipal Court in January, many supporters accom-

panied him and angrily yelled at members of the press to "leave him alone." This morning, there was only one supporter, a woman without bail until his sentencing. A church spokesman said he is still conducting services but is no longer doing any counseling. There has been no word about what action, if any, the Catholic Church will take.

Roemer remains free during the court appearance. Her eyes welled with tears after the pleas were entered, she said nothing. Instead, she quietly left the courtroom alone, did not give her name and com-

VENTURA COUNTY STAR FREE PRESS
MAY 30, 1981

84



Robert L. Shaw swears in eight new — among them, his daughter Martha Shaw (inset) of Camarillo

daughter as lawyer

who was offered a position District Attorney's Office; Brown of Port Hueneme; Jan Olney of Ventura; and Samuel Williams of Ventura. graduates were the largest in the Ventura college to take Bar examination with success. Shaw could barely contain his joy gratulated his daughter, joining the law firm of Gitterman & Associates in Ventura. "I wanted to be an attorney all my life and I've helped her plan her life around the premise that that was what she wanted to be," said Shaw. She will be in the courthouse Friday.

day, Oxnard resident Carol Rodriguez, another person who passed the bar examination, was sworn in as an attorney by Municipal Court Judge Art Gutierrez. She is filling a vacancy in the Public Defender's Office left by Gutierrez, who was recently appointed judge. Others who passed the Bar examination who were not listed previously by the Star-Free Press are Michael L. Muirhead of Oak View; Lawrence Andrew Valdivieso of Ventura; Michael J. Sugar of Simi Valley; Joseph Anthony Violante of Thousand Oaks; and Stephen Gary Youngerman of Westlake Village.

Judge sentences molester priest to state hospital

By Gregg Zoroya

The Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer was led from court into custody Friday afternoon for eventual transportation to Atascadero State Hospital, where he will be treated as a mentally disordered sex offender. The 36-year-old Catholic priest, a former religious instructor for children at St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church, Thousand Oaks, is an admitted child molester. After Roemer has 90 days of examination at the state hospital for criminal sex offenders, officials there may find that the facility is inappropriate and recommend something more lenient. But the priest could remain there for 10 1/2 years.

Superior Court Judge Robert L. Shaw's choice of Atascadero was a major defeat for Roemer, whose attorney argued that the state facility was too severe a confinement. But Shaw said the seriousness of Roemer's crimes weighed heavily against him. Shaw said he is bothered that the victims originally placed their faith in the priest, and the parents were willing to put their children in his care.

"I suppose (for them) it's almost like God committed a crime," Shaw said. The decision on where to send the priest for treatment was the final phase in the well-publicized case. It began in late January with the shocking announcement that a Thousand Oaks Catholic priest had been arrested for molesting young members of his parish. On March 10, Roemer pleaded no contest (the equivalent to a guilty plea in a criminal case) to three counts of molesting young boys. One incident occurred in a confessional. Court documents revealed that Roemer has admitted several other molestations to authorities. Prosecu-

tor Joe Taylor, a deputy district attorney, cited 30 victims in the past 11 years.

Based on psychiatric examinations, Shaw ruled May 8 that Roemer is a mentally disordered sex offender and amenable to treatment. Although Shaw leaned toward sending the priest to Atascadero, he ordered County Mental Health Program Director Dr. William C. Keating to examine alternative mental health institutions. Keating's report, as well as comments by the examining psychiatrists and interviews with officials at Atascadero, provided defense attorney Bruce Mayfield of Oxnard with a considerable basis for arguing that the state hospital is too severe a confinement for Roemer.

Keating, for example, rejected Atascadero as a placement. Mayfield said that officials he contacted at Atascadero said a patient like Roemer might not respond well to treatment at the hospital. Confinement among the chronic, violent inmates at that institution could cause irreparable harm to the priest, Mayfield said. Even Taylor cited an incident in which a priest, under similar circumstances, did not obtain suitable treatment at Atascadero.

One institution Keating recommended and Mayfield pushed for was St. Mary's Hospital, San Francisco. Taylor pointed out that St. Mary's is a licensed, qualified private facility. It would save taxpayers the cost of confinement at Atascadero — between \$10,000 and \$35,000, Taylor said. There was never any indication of who would pay for Roemer's confinement in a private facility. But Taylor said he learned that St. Mary's has never handled a mentally disordered sex offender case. Shaw noted this in his decision and added that, because it is private, there would be no accountability to the courts.

to oust Caltrans chief

onestly, the Legislature is fed up with her unresponsiveness in handling the state's transportation needs, said Downey. She has often battled with Mr.

is incapable of handling the Transportation Department." Many legislators view Ms. Gianturco as a "front" for highway policies advocated by Brown, said Downey.

Oxnard veteran's protest

Continued from A-1

taken since his return from the war he said. "I said 409883 stop sit!

Atascadero attempts to cure sex offenders

Attention was focused recently on child molestation when a Catholic priest was convicted of molesting boys. This story, the first of two parts, examines the kind of treatment sex offenders can receive from the state.

By WALT STEGMEIR

Daily News Staff Writer

The future home of the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer, the former Thousand Oaks priest convicted of molesting boys, is a pink L-shaped building set among the hills of Atascadero, a small community 18 miles north of San Luis Obispo.

Atascadero State Hospital houses behind three steel doors not only hundreds of sex offenders who prey on children, but also violent rapists and the criminally insane.

Yet despite the violent background of many of the 1,000 hospital patients, staff members, including women, walk down the long corridors unmolested and hospital officials report attacks on staff members are rare.

It is behind these walls of the hospital, for the next months or possibly years, that Roemer will receive therapy and treatment that hospital officials hope will deter the 37-year-old priest from fondling young boys in the future.

Whether Roemer can be cured of his pedophilia — the unnatural desire to molest boys — is an unanswered question. Roemer has admitted to molesting at least 30 boys over a period of 11 years and some experts believe pedophiles cannot be successfully cured of their unnatural desires.

These experts take the position that pedophilia may not be a mental illness but is essentially a lifestyle that never changes.

They say there is no certainty as to the cause of pedophilia, no known cure and no reliable clinical ability to predict future dangerousness.

One well-known expert who takes this position is Dr. Roland Summit of the Harbor-UCLA Medical Center and a recognized authority in the area of child molesting.

During a hearing last year on changing the child molesting laws, Summit described pedophiles as men who have "a lifetime sexual desire for children." The doctor said pedophiles do not come across as criminals or the mentally disturbed, but believe they have the "right and duty" to molest children.

As a result of this viewpoint, there is currently pending legislation in Sacramento to not only lengthen prison sentences for child molesters, but to require that if they are treated at Atascadero that they be returned to prison to serve out their sentence once treatment is completed.

Roemer is under a 10-year, four-month maximum commitment. This is the longest time he could be committed to Atascadero, or if the judge finds he would not benefit from further treatment, be sentenced to state prison.

Ventura County Superior Court Judge Robert Shaw, who found Roemer to be a mentally disordered sex offender and amenable to hospital treatment, has ordered that the first progress report on the priest be filed by Sept. 1.

Roemer will probably be transferred to Atascadero this week according to county jail officials. At Atascadero he will be seen by a psychiatrist and a mental profile will be developed, said David B. Hamilton,

assistant to the hospital medical director.

The hospital staff will then determine what kind of treatment program Roemer should be placed in, Hamilton said. He said this assessment can take 60 days or longer.

There are different treatment programs at Atascadero, Hamilton said. A child molester could end up in the same program as a violent rapist if the program is aimed at solving a basic problem that led to sex crime, Hamilton said.

One program dealing with sex offenders who are judged to be a danger to others, such as Roemer, deals with sex-related problems through group therapy and other consciousness-raising groups and seeks to teach the men self-evaluation and self-discipline, Hamilton said.

There is also a service at the hospital, offered by Dr. Richard Laws, that seeks to cure deviant sexual behavior through aversion therapy.

Deputy District Attorney Joseph E. Taylor, who handled the prosecution of Roemer and did research on treatment offered at Atascadero, explained that it is first determined what kind of sexual activity excites the patient.

Once this is determined, the patient is shown pictures or movies of this kind of sexual activity and when becomes excited an ampule containing ammonia is released, Taylor said. In theory, the patient begins to associate the unpleasant experience of the ammonia with the deviant sexual behavior and no longer is attracted by this kind of sexual activity, Taylor said.

MONDAY: What happens to the victims of child molesters.

85
Daily News June 7, 1981

Trauma of molested boys varies

Mon., June 8, 1981/DAILY NEWS

86

Hospital may discover identities of the others

Attention was focused recently on child molestation when a Catholic priest was convicted of molesting boys. This article, the second of two parts, concerns the trauma that affects victims of molestation.

By WALT STEGMEIR

Daily News Staff Writer

While the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer is undergoing treatment at Atascadero State Hospital, some of his child-molesting victims are also undergoing counseling for the trauma they suffered from that Thousand Oaks priest.

Roemer, 37, has admitted to molesting 30 boys during the past 11 years. Fifteen of those 30 have been identified, said Deputy District Attorney Joseph E. Taylor, and the incidents go back about a year.

The victims who have been identified range in age from 6 to 14, and Taylor said some are undergoing counseling for the psychological damage they have suffered. Taylor said he hopes the boys would not suffer any longtime psychological effects.

In many cases, Roemer fondled the boys to obtain sexual gratification, and Taylor said the trauma from this kind of molesting is usually less than in cases in which a man engages in specific sexual acts, such as sodomy, with a boy over a long period of time.

For one boy, however, the fondling continued over a period of several months and the effect on the boy was very destructive, Taylor said. The boy's grades at school went down and the boy did not want to attend church, Taylor said.

It was just recently that the other child molestings, which go back to 1970, came to light. Taylor said there is no way his office can force Roemer to identify them.

Once Roemer is placed in a treatment program at Atascadero State Hospital, however,

doctors have the power to make Roemer try to recall who the other victims are, Taylor said.

If the identification of these boys, who now might be adults, is made, then the question is how to deal with a molestation that occurred years ago, Taylor said.

Taylor indicated the best approach would probably be to find out if there is a potentially damaged child and then proceed from there. The parents of the boys would probably be notified that their sons were molestation victims, Taylor said.

Only recently has there been increased concern about the victims of child molestation. Previously, thousands of dollars were spent treating convicted child molesters at Atascadero and other state hospitals, but little attention was paid to what happened to the victims.

One man who has concerned himself with the victims is Dr. Herman Kagan, director of the children's program for the county mental health department in the Simi-Conejo Valley areas.

Kagan said a boy or girl who is sexually molested by someone he or she trusts often develops very confused feelings, because he or she both trusts the molester but is also frightened.

"When (children are) confused, they feel they have done something wrong," Kagan said. He said one of the purposes of therapy is to help the child

understand this confusion is a natural reaction to trusting someone and then seeing something happen that makes him or her afraid.

In counseling, the doctor tries to explain to the child that he or she is not the one at fault in the molesting and it was the adult's responsibility not to engage in such action, Kagan said. "It is often difficult to convince a child he is not the one at fault."

Kagan said this same kind of confusion also occurs in rape cases and the victim starts to believe she was at fault. It is important to "get the blame shifted to the right party and get the confusion cleared up," Kagan said.

In working with victims of child molesting, Kagan said, parents play a very important supporting role. "If the parents support the child, it certainly makes it a lot easier," Kagan said. Without the parents' support, the child can feel he or she "is not only abused by the abuser, but he is also abused by those who are supposed to provide him with support," Kagan said.

Kagan said child molesting can result in the child's developing doubts about himself and his own worth. "The child thinks he is damaged goods, he is bad," Kagan said.

The damage caused by a child molestation might surface later in life, when the person is in his or her 30s, Kagan said.

Officer wounded on robbery call

PHOENIX (UPI) — A Phoenix police officer suffered a minor gunshot wound to the hand when a liquor store clerk mistook him for a robbery suspect.

Police said an armed man forced Michael El Mani, 21, an employee of Buckeye Liquors, to hand over about \$150 Saturday night.

As the suspect was leaving, El Mani pulled out a .357 magnum revolver and fired a shot, driving

investigators said. Nearby officers heard the shot and responded to the scene.

As Officer William Heydenreich was approaching the door with a drawn gun, police said El Mani looked up, saw the gun and fired a round — striking the officer in the left hand.

Heydenreich was treated and released. El Mani does not face any charges, investigators said.

409885

August 9, 1982 / \$1.50

Newsweek®

*Kyle
Koene*

Japan's High-Tech Challenge

**Special
Report**



Kamigata

409886

JUSTICE



Brad Holland

The perfect crime: Children are uniquely vulnerable victims, and courts are often lenient toward offenders

Beware of Child Molesters

The idea that adults might be sexually attracted to children is so offensive that most parents prefer not to think about it. They should. By conservative estimates, one out of 10 children is sexually abused each year, often by a trusted authority figure—a teacher, doctor or camp counselor—or by the parents themselves. In Pittsburgh a 24-year-old secretary is serving five years on probation for molesting the four-year-old girl for whom she baby-sat. A former mayor of Alamogordo, N.M., was convicted recently on five counts of sex crimes involving young girls. And a Roman Catholic priest in charge of youth affairs at his church in suburban Los Angeles confessed to between 20 and 30 homosexual encounters with minors. Sexual child abuse cuts across all social, economic and racial strata. Irving Prager, a California attorney who used to prosecute child molesters, believes that "it is probably the most common serious crime against a person in the United States."

It is also the perfect crime. In every respect, children are singularly vulnerable victims. They can be easily persuaded to cooperate with molesters and are then too afraid or ashamed to talk about it with their parents (page 46). On that rare occasion when a sex offender is reported and convicted, there is an excellent chance that the courts will intervene on his behalf and that he will soon be walking the streets again; for the last 30 years the criminal-justice system has accepted the psychiatric consensus that child molestation is a treatable illness, a viewpoint that rarely results in a full prison term for offenders. That consensus is now

crumbling, largely under pressure from a California-based organization called Society's League Against Molestation (SLAM) and its offshoots around the country. The citizens' groups argue that the best way to treat child molesters is to keep them locked away from their prey. Since it was founded two years ago, SLAM has lobbied successfully for five California laws that make the crime a bit less easy to get away with.

One out of 10 youngsters is sexually abused each year—usually by someone the victim knows and trusts.

Even though up to two-thirds of all child molestation cases never come to light, the number of reported incidents has grown rapidly since the mid-1970s. In California the number of known offenses climbed from 2,281 in 1977 to 8,804 last year, and the Los Angeles district attorney's office says that a third of the sex-abuse cases it handles involve child victims. "I suspect that this is a much more serious and frequent crime than rape," says Dr. Gene G. Abel, director of the Sexual Behavior Clinic at the New York State Psychiatric Institute. Abel's study of 238 sex offenders showed that each child molester was responsible for abusing an average of 68.3 young victims—more than

three times the number of adult women assaulted by each rapist.

Many parents believe their children will be safe if they don't talk to strangers. But according to David Finkelhor, assistant director of the Family Violence Research Program at the University of New Hampshire, victims and their parents know the assailants in two-thirds of the cases. A third of the victims in his study were molested by a relative and an equal number by an acquaintance. "We're still teaching our children the myth that it's the stranger in the big Cadillac who offers them candy," warns David Lloyd, a staff attorney at the special child-abuse unit of Washington's Children's Hospital National Medical Center. "But it can be the Boy Scout leader, ice-cream vendor, people who have professional access to children or a lot of interest in them."


'Pied Piper': Or it can be the family priest. The case of the Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer is virtually an allegory of trust abused. Until a year ago Roemer was the youth minister of St. Paschal Roman Catholic Church in Thousand Oaks, Calif., a position placing him in frequent contact with his young charges. "He was like a Pied Piper to the children," recalled one parishioner recently. "He had a very good rapport with the kids, especially the boys." He also gained the confidence of their families; when the parents of two brothers, seven and ten years old, had Roemer investigated and arrested for fondling their sons, many parishioners accused local authorities of persecuting the priest. His church superiors, it turned out, knew of another incident involving a young boy but did not discipline Roemer. Despite prosecution efforts to imprison him, a superior-court judge sentenced him to confine-

JUSTICE

ment in a California state mental hospital.

Father Roemer was diagnosed as a "fixated pedophile," an adult who is compulsively and almost exclusively aroused by children. Fixated pedophiles are one of the two main types of molesters. Usually they are white males with an attraction to young boys—a preference that does not extend to adult men. They frequently identify with and have affection for their victims. The reason, according to A. Nicholas Groth, director of the sex-offender program at the Connecticut Correctional Institution in Somers, is that an enormous number of child molesters—81 percent of the convicted pedophiles in that state—were themselves abused as children. "The pedophile is re-enacting his own victimization," says Groth, "but he wants to change it into a warm and loving experience, where he is in control, to purge the original fear." Despite his warm feelings, the pedophile is not above threatening a child with harm either to himself or his family to get what he wants—which could be anything from fondling and mutual masturbation to anal or oral intercourse.

Incest: The second major category of molester is the "regressed offender." He is a man with a normal heterosexual orientation who turns to young girls at a crisis point, such as a divorce or a professional setback. Boston attorney Richard Bourne cites the case of a 65-year-old widower with no previous history of child molestation; he was accused of fondling his neighbor's daughter, who brought over cookies to cheer him up after his wife died. Frequently, regressed



Jacques M. Chenet—New

Abel treating a patient: A debate over whether molesters can be cured

offenders will suddenly begin to molest their own children. But according to Abel, the majority of men who commit incest do so because they are genuinely aroused by children, not because of family dynamics. "They are child molesters who stay at home," he says.

Because of the peculiar circumstances, regressed offenders are considered highly treatable. A growing number of sex-abuse experts, however, are pessimistic about curing molesters who have a lifelong history of emotional as well as sexual involvement with children. Pedophilia, says Los Angeles sex-crimes prosecutor Jacqueline Connor,

"is nothing more than a preference, homosexuality. Unfortunately, the [sex activity] is never consensual." UCLA psychiatry Prof. Roland Summit believes most child molesters belong in prison, not state mental hospitals, where they will neither be cured nor confined for very long. "You can't say [pedophilia] is an illness more than you can say bank robbery is illness," says Summit. "Treatment has been used as an escape from responsibility."

This is precisely the rallying cry of SLAM, which now has 45 chapters in California and counterparts in at least seven states. The organization was found

Acting Out a Secret

Most young victims of sexual abuse have been bribed or threatened not to talk about the experience. Molesters make a pact of secrecy with children—and that silence can be the source of their most intense suffering. Often it is far worse than the physical abuse. "These children don't have broken bones, but they have broken psyches," says Ann Burgess, a nursing specialist at Boston City Hospital. "What really damages them is keeping it all bottled up." To break the silence, Burgess directs a pioneering treatment program at City Hospital, in which young victims describe their experiences and express their feelings in a special form of play therapy.

A few simple toys enable children to reveal incidents they cannot—or will not—put into words. "Anatomically correct" dolls, with genitals and yarn for pubic hair, permit children to stage a sexual assault. Speaking through the mouth of a puppet frees them to tell a secret without directly breaking a pledge of secrecy. Drawing, however, is the most effective method of externalizing memories and emotions. Last May, four-year-old Sophie, bleeding in the vagina, was brought to the pediatric clinic at City Hospital. Sullen and passive, she refused to explain her injury, so nurses gave her crayons and paper. Sophie first sketched a small stick-figure portrait of herself with an orange slash across the pelvis. Next to it she drew a large, ferocious figure with oversize male genitals colored in red. After hesitating, Sophie tearfully

explained that the large figure was a counselor at her day-center, and that he had shoved his fingers into her anus and vagina. With that admission the small girl began cavorting around the clinic, proudly announcing that she had told her "secret." Lorna Bernhard, the clinic's head nurse, "It was a sudden, miraculous change."

Children forced to keep their secret for any length of time develop psychosomatic disorders. As many as 10 a week come to City Hospital suffering from nightmares, insomnia or stomach cramps. Eight-year-old Nicholas was admitted after stom-

Anatomically detailed dolls: They express what words cannot

Gerald S. W.



by Patti Linebaugh, whose two-year-old granddaughter, Amy Sue Seitz, was raped, mutilated and murdered by Theodore Frank in March 1978—just weeks after his release from the Atascadero State Hospital. Despite his 20-year history of child molestation, the articulate Frank not only had persuaded staff psychiatrists that he was rehabilitated, but was showcased before other inmates as an example of what therapy could accomplish. Although Frank was sentenced to death in the Seitz case, the trial judge acknowledged that he could be freed in 12 years for good behavior. "When he said that, I decided to do everything in my power to prevent Frank from ever being released," says Linebaugh.

Background: One of SLAM's first accomplishments was eliminating California's "Mentally Disordered Sex Offenders" program, which had allowed Frank to be treated rather than punished. The group also pressured legislators into requiring a minimum of three years in prison for all repeat offenders and for first-time offenders who used force or engaged in "substantial" sexual conduct, such as oral, vaginal or anal intercourse. The Colorado SLAM plans to reintroduce a bill requiring an investigation into the background of applicants for youth-related jobs. Though of questionable constitutionality, Colorado SLAM cofounder Becky Davis argues that the bill "is only reasonable. [Molesters] don't pick these kids up in bars, they go where the kids are."

Critics of SLAM regard it as the "castration fringe." They argue that putting child molesters into prison without therapy will only reinforce their drives and thus ultimately increase their threat to society. One

reason is that child molestation violates even the honor code of convicts: pedophiles who admit why they're in prison are likely to be beaten by fellow inmates. If they discuss their urges with mental-health authorities, they jeopardize their release. Consequently, says Dr. Abel, the imprisoned molester "focuses more and more on his fantasies and he comes out the way he came in." Abel believes that molesters can be successfully treated. At Abel's Sexual Behavior Clinic, the only voluntary, free, outpatient program in the country, a staff of 17 uses behavior-modification techniques to make child-oriented fantasies repulsive to molesters.

Testimony: Sex-abuse experts are also developing ways to shepherd young victims through the criminal-justice system. At the Children's Hospital in Washington, psychologists, social workers, doctors and a lawyer are available around the clock to treat child-molestation victims for injuries, test for venereal disease and collect medical evidence to use in court. In Baltimore the State's Attorney's Sexual Offense Task Force has managed to surmount one of the foremost obstacles in prosecuting these cases: getting credible testimony from young victims, who are usually fuzzy about when and where the abuse occurred. Task-force chief Edwin Wenck has successfully used such childlike—but reliable—testimony as, "It happened two days after Peggy's birthday party." He prepares children for the trial by walking them through the courtroom and making the sort of "evil eyes" a defense lawyer might use to intimidate them. In New Mexico, the prosecution is allowed to videotape children's testimony

in certain cases to spare them the trauma of appearing in open court.

Despite the legal prejudices against child testimony, there is good reason to believe that most youngsters are telling the truth. "The younger a kid is, the more believable he is," claims Gerry Ronneburger, a founder of a Long Island citizens' group called "Reform All Sexual Child Abuse Laws." David Lloyd of Children's Hospital in Washington suggests that a child who suddenly becomes familiar with the technical names for genitalia or can describe sex in any detail may well have been abused. Sometimes children come away from the experience with strong sexual feelings. Rhoda Mills Sommer, a sex-abuse counselor at the Pittsburgh Action Against Rape, says that parents should be aware that child victims may have experienced pleasure as well as fear. "One of the ways we mess kids up is to tell them they only had bad feelings," says Sommer.


Children are frequently flirtatious, too. "There are kids who are terribly seductive," says Jean Lothian, a vice president of the research center Odyssey Institute. "Around the wrong people, that behavior will be misinterpreted and exploited." Sex-abuse experts encourage parents to teach their children the difference between acceptable and unacceptable ways for them to be touched, as well as who has the right to touch them. Molesters are as threatening to children as drunk drivers, says Dr. Abel, and children should learn how to avoid them—just as they learn to look both ways when they cross the street.

ELOISE SALHOLZ with JOE CONTRERAS in Los Angeles, JOHN TAYLOR in Boston, MARILYN ACHIRON in Washington and JACOB YOUNG in Pittsburgh

aches kept him from school. Asked to draw a picture of himself, Nicholas included male genitals and female breasts on the figure. Under questioning by the staff, he admitted that at camp the previous summer he had been sodomized by a counselor. As his drawings suggested, the assault had distorted his self-image. "He was attacked by a man and could only understand it by seeing himself as someone feminine," explained Burgess. "He thought he had become like a girl."

The hospital's pediatric clinic has a staff of 20 trained nurses to treat young victims of sexual abuse, each handling as many as

Sophie's self-portrait: Painting away broken psyches



eight cases at a time. Children visit the clinic once a week for the first few months and then twice a month for as long as a year. As they play, draw and talk in brightly painted rooms, their phobias emerge and in time can be purged. Follow-up studies by City Hospital show that roughly 90 percent of the children resume normal lives. Sophie, who is black, had been assaulted by a white man and had developed a fear of all white males. She is now growing friendly with the hospital's white male doctors. Nicholas worried that because he had been sodomized, he would turn homosexual. Over time his counselor convinced him that the fear was groundless, and the hermaphroditic breasts eventually disappeared from his self-portraits. Says Bernhard: "We don't want the children to bury or to dwell on their sexual abuse. We want them to put it into perspective."

Prosecution: In addition to their duties at the clinic, the nurses work with the children who testify at the molester's trial. Sometimes they also assist in the prosecution; the Suffolk County district attorney plans to call Lorna Bernhard as a witness in the trial against the man accused of molesting Sophie. Other hospitals around the country now offer treatment similar to the services available at Boston City Hospital. And today more than 150 communities nationwide field teams specially trained to treat molested children. In view of the evidence that untreated victims of sexual abuse frequently grow up to become molesters themselves, the new programs may help break a very vicious circle.

JOHN TAYLOR in Boston

explained when Northridge civic leaders announced plans to cover a bare wall with a gigantic multicolored mural. The mural's brightly colored nudes started ap-

proving residents near the 10-by-97-foot parking lot wall angrily called the mural "a few even wanted to call the

work "it was nothing to be worried about," said Juan Pueblo, the Mexican artist entrusted to design

the mural. "The message of the painting is to show that you can have a good time if you are willing to work hard. The complaints ended."

The mural is the product of four months' work, completed at 10:30 a.m. June 11. It will include music, food and local officials and civic leaders.

The mural is considered a bright spot in this section of Northridge, which some police feel is crime-ridden.

On the south side of the 19000 block of

Parthenia Street, the mural features powerful symbols of personal growth, spiritual renewal and dedication toward a goal—traditional themes in Mexico, where Pueblo learned his craft.

"Juan came up with a topic primarily designed to help youngsters avoid the frustrations that can lead to involvement with gangs," said one of the mural's three lead painters, Augustine Bravo, 28, of Van Nuys, "that they should reach for a better tomorrow."

Local youngsters, some of them street-gang members, lent a hand patching holes and painting.

"By inviting the public to paint with us," Pueblo said, "we turned this into a cultural movement."

Project sponsors included the county Department of Mental Health, the Los Angeles City Mural Project, Neighborhood Approach to Positive Action, the Kiwanis Club of Northridge, Napa Street Elementary School and the Los Angeles Police Department.

—LOUIS SAHAGUN

Times photographs
by Joel P. Lugavere



Artist Juan Pueblo

Convicted Priest Named in Earlier Molestations

Records Show Roemer Admitted Homosexual Acts With Santa Barbara Boys

By JAMES QUINN, Times Staff Writer

A former Thousand Oaks parish priest who last week was placed on 10 years probation for molesting 15 local boys has admitted to molesting an equal number of youngsters during an earlier assignment in Santa Barbara, according to court documents.

The Rev. Donald Patrick Roemer, a 39-year-old admitted homosexual, reportedly made the new admission during interviews with Ventura County Probation Department staff members prior to his sentencing by Ventura Superior Court Judge Robert L. Shaw.

According to the interviews, Roemer admitted molesting about 15 young boys during assignments at two Santa Barbara-area Catholic parishes between 1970 and 1978.

In pre-sentencing interviews, Roemer also told probation officers that he twice sought help from priest-counselors in Santa Barbara and that he told the counselors about his child molestation.

No charges were filed in Santa Barbara against Roemer, according to Ventura County prosecutors.

Roemer, known affectionately as "Father Pat" to youths he counseled at St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church in Thousand Oaks from 1978 to 1981, pleaded no contest in 1981 to three felony counts of child molestation. He also signed a confession admitting to molesting 12 other boys ages 6 to 14 in the Conejo Valley.

For the past two years, Roemer, who remains a priest, has been undergoing court-ordered treatment at Atascadero State Hospital aimed at reorienting his sexual interest away from boys to adult males.

At last week's hearing, Atascadero officials said Roemer had made substantial progress and should be released under strict probation.

Shaw approved a plan under which Roemer will live in a secluded Woodland Hills guest house and work at a West Los Angeles religious bookstore.

While turning aside a prosecution request that Roemer be sentenced to a year in jail, Shaw imposed a suspended sentence of 8 years, 4 months. The judge said the sentence would be carried out if Roemer

should engage in further child molestation.

Shaw also ordered Roemer to pay the costs of therapy for his victims.

At an earlier pre-sentencing hearing for Roemer, parents of Conejo Valley victims testified that they had notified church officials in Thousand Oaks and Los Angeles that their sons had been molested by Roemer but that nothing was done.

One mother testified she wrote a detailed letter to the office of Cardinal Timothy Manning in Los Angeles but in reply received only a short note "saying they would pray for us."

A spokesman at the Archdiocese of Los Angeles declined comment.

Another mother told how her son was molested by Roemer while on a church-sponsored camping trip near San Bernardino. She quoted the boy as saying,

"As he (Roemer) was talking about how wonderful God was, he started moving his hands down into my pants."

Several parents testified they notified Father Colm O'Ryan, pastor at St. Paschal

Please see PRIEST, Page

CITY: Voluntary Tax

92

LAS VEGAS Restores 12

First Page

in the past to pay for extra security. It has approved a committee recommendation that an ordinance be drafted. There will be a hearing before the council votes on the ordinance, Bernson said.

Spokesman for Los Angeles Police Chief Daryl F. Bernson said the police department would not oppose Bernson's ordinance but would be more enthusiastic about it if city police officers were going to provide the extra security.

'May Be Only Practical Option'

"It may be the only practical option Bernson has, but it is not the most desirable one," said William Booth, the department spokesman.

Bernson said he, too, would prefer to use city police officers. But he and other local officials said they are not sure whether state law permits the selective employment of city police to patrol neighborhoods whose residents are willing to pay extra.

"It would mean that more affluent communities would be able to avail themselves of something that poorer neighborhoods couldn't afford, and that could lead to an accusation of unequal protection under the law," said James Williams, director of intergovernmental relations for the Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst.

Williams said a bill has been introduced in the Assembly that would authorize use of city police in special districts.

Even in its present form, the proposed ordinance could be subject to challenge as a prohibited method of assessment under the terms of Proposition 13.

Assessments Must Have Direct Benefit

Since Proposition 13 was approved, assessments levied by special districts must be shown to confer a direct benefit on the property of the owners being assessed.

Roberts, the assistant city attorney who is drafting the ordinance, said recently that an argument could be made that extra security in a neighborhood does not necessarily improve the value of private property in that neighborhood.

"Such a case could be made, although I think the law is on our side," Roberts said.

Robbins said he is convinced that frequent security patrols in the Tampa-Bryant neighborhood would improve the value of his property.

"In my buildings, I think it would make a substantial difference in the vacancy rate. It would definitely have an economic impact," he said.

Continued from First Page

that the district erred in setting off while skipping over old Board members said. The layoff list had nothing to do with the ruling, however.

District leaders said they added to their budget for the six-month-old Legislature, an independent group up to solicit funding.

A four-night telephone staged last week raised and pledged officials at a fundraising event raised \$20,000, and early \$38,000, said group spokesman.

About 45 volunteers at the State Farm Insurance Westlake Village during about 2,500 families.

Foundation director to call another 1,550, said Johnson, who described the project as "very encouraged" by pledges ranging from averaging about \$30

PRIEST: Roemer Named in Earlier Cases

Continued from First Page

of their sons' reports of molestation but that no action was taken against Roemer.

Deputy Dist. Atty. Joseph E. Taylor said that "subsequent to church officials being notified, at least 11 more boys were molested."

A spokeswoman at St. Paschal's said O'Ryan was on extended leave and unavailable for comment. The pastor previously declined comment in the case.

During his three years at St. Paschal's, Roemer was widely praised for his work with children and sometimes was asked by local police to counsel troubled youths.

The Conejo Valley Parent Teacher Assn. awarded him its 1980 Honorary Service Award for his work as counselor to children and organizer of youth activities.

After Roemer's arrest in January, 1981, parents began a letter-writing campaign on his behalf, accusing police and prosecutors of being too quick to believe Roemer's youthful accusers.

At the priest's preliminary hearing, a handful of parents physically shielded Roemer from reporters. One woman screamed at a photographer seeking to take the priest's picture.

In defending Roemer, parents contended that priests who work with young boys are frequently the victims of molestation accusations.

Such support ceased within 10 days of Roemer's arrest, however, when Dist. Atty. Michael Bradbury released a confession signed by Roemer detailing the

numerous times he had molested Thousand Oaks boys. Prosecutor Taylor argued in court last week that the high degree of trust Roemer had achieved in the Conejo Valley, and his abuse of that trust, was a reason for sending him to jail for a year.

Taylor also noted that the molestation acts were premeditated and occurred "over a very long period of time."

But Bruce Mayfield, Roemer's attorney, argued that the priest had cooperated in every way with police and psychiatrists since his arrest and that "every psychiatrist and therapist who has come in contact with Father Roemer has agreed that he is coping with his psychiatric problems."

Mayfield also contended that Roemer's stay of nearly two years at Atascadero was "for all practical purposes a form of incarceration."

Taylor estimated that Roemer will have to pay therapy cost for his victims of at least \$3,000 and "probably a lot more as time goes on."

THE EUROPEAN

5 DAY SPECIAL



COMPUTER: Charges Fly Over CompuPlus



Party King

25% OFF

WEDDING/BAR MITZVAH INVITATIONS

LARGEST SELECTION IN THE VALLEY

135 UNIQUE & CONTEMPORARY PARTY ENSEMBLES AND DESIGNER COLORS TO CHOOSE FROM—AT DISCOUNT PRICES

GRADUATION & SUMMER FUN PARTY GOODS & DECORATIONS

20% OFF ALL OCCASIONS

409891

434-3342 6038 RESEDA BLVD.

93


Certificate of Authenticity of the Acts

409892

Certification of the Authenticity of the Acts

CASE: Donald Patrick Roemer

By this document, I certify that the Acts of the above-captioned case, beginning with the Table of Contents (page i) and ending with this Certificate (page 94) are exact duplicates of the original documentation and form the authentic Acts of the petition for dismissal from the clerical state to be transmitted to the Holy Father through the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.



Rev. Alexander Salazar
Vice-Chancellor

Given at Los Angeles, California, this 8th day of April in the Year of Our Lord 2003.

ID	55
CMOB #	055
Case Name	Donald Roemer
Active Case?	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cleric Name	Roemer, Donald P.
Cleric Age	
Cleric Ethnicity	
Incardination	
Date Of Ordination	
Clergy Status	
Date Referred To Vicar	
Claimant	
Date Of Alleged Incident	
Investigation Complete	<input type="checkbox"/>
Investigator Name	
Date Investigation Initiated	
Date Investigation Completed	
Case Disposition	
Intervention	<input type="checkbox"/>
Description	Arrested in Ventura in the early 1980's and basically confessed upon arrest. He pleaded guilty to three counts, did some time in prison and has been out of ministry since that time. He has never petitioned for laicization.
Case Status	
April 09, 2003	Msgr. Cox reported that paperwork and documents have been prepared for formal petition for dismissal from the clerical state outside a tribunal to be sent to Rome shortly.
November 10, 2004	He has agreed to petition for laicization. Rome has been requested to dismiss him if he does not follow through with the petition.
March 09, 2005	It was announced that he has not voluntarily petitioned for laicization.
Follow Up	
Follow Up Date	
Legal Proceedings	
Sent To Rome?	<input type="checkbox"/> Date Sent To Rome
Canonical Trial	<input type="checkbox"/> Canonical Trial Date
Canonical Disposition	
Page	

Vicar for Clergy Database

Clergy Assignment Record

Mr Donald Patrick Roemer

**1700 N. Community Drive
Anaheim, CA 92806**

Current Primary Assignment

Birth Date 3/17/1944
Birth City Oxnard, California, USA
Diaconate Ordination
Priesthood Ordination 5/23/1970
Diocese Name Archdiocese of Los Angeles
Date of Incardination 4/1/1966
Religious Community
Ritual Ascription Latin
Ministry Status To Lay State
Seminary St. John's Seminary, Camarillo
Ethnicity American (USA)

Age 65*Deanery* 0*Language(s)*

Spanish

Fluency

Conversational Basics

Fingerprint Verification and Safeguard Training*Date Background Check**Safeguard Training***Assignment History*****Assignment******Beginning Date Completion Date***

Returned To Lay State, Rescript from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Protocol No. 165/2003.

5/9/2006

Inactive Leave, Mail Returned. No current address

12/21/1989

5/8/2006

Sick Leave

2/1/1981

12/20/1989

St. Paschal Baylon Catholic Church, Thousand Oaks Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service

6/19/1978

1/31/1981

Chaplain, Active Service, Los Prietos Boys Camp, Santa Barbara

4/11/1977

6/18/1978

Coordinator, Active Service, Part-time coordinator, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Santa Barbara

8/15/1976

4/10/1977

Chaplain, Active Service, Santa Barbara Juvenile Hall

12/17/1975

4/10/1977

San Roque Catholic Church, Santa Barbara Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service

6/17/1974

6/18/1978

St. Raphael Catholic Church, Santa Barbara Associate Pastor (Parochial
Vicar), Active Service

6/6/1970

6/16/1974

ACCUSED NAME: ^{MR} ~~FR.~~ DONALD ROEMER DATE: 4/16/2010



CONFIDENTIAL

ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
Child Abuse Report - Internal Routing Form

This report involves allegations of:

☐ Current Minor and Church Employee/volunteer
☐ Current Minor and Priest
☒ Past Minor and Priest
☐ Past Minor and Religious Brother
☐ Past Minor and Religious Sister
☐ Adult/Adult Case
☐ Other

Sexual abuse: ☒

Physical abuse: ☐

Harassment: ☐

Brief Summary: Sexual abuse of minor in 1960s or 1970s

To:

☒ ☒ Msgr. Michael Meyers - Vicar for Clergy *Margaret Franco*
☒ REDACTED
☒

REDACTED

REDACTED

Submitted by _____ Office _____

Date distributed: 4-19-2010

Comments: Priest has been Returned to Lay State 5/2006.



**ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT REPORTING FORM**

<input type="checkbox"/> MANDATORY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NON-MANDATORY
Date Reported to the Archdiocese:	4/14/2010
Reported to Archdiocese by:	REDACTED
Alleged Victim :	
Current Address:	
Telephone:	
Date of Birth:	REDACTED 2010
Alleged Perpetrator:	Fr. Donald Roemer While at St. Raphael's Goleta/Santa Barbara
Reported Date of Incident: (s)	1960s and 1970s
Reported Circumstances of Incident(s):	REDACTED reports that he attended the school in grades 1 through 8. He reports that the abuse began in 2 nd grade and continued until the 3 rd grade when the priest was transferred. He makes reference to being an altar boy at the time the abuse occurred so it may have been later than the 3 rd grade. REDACTED alleges that he was molested, raped and sodomized by this priest 2-3 times a week over a two year period of time. The priest would call for him from the classroom or the playground to come to the rectory where the abuse occurred. REDACTED also reports that the priest would tell him that this is what Jesus wanted him to do and Jesus did not want REDACTED to tell anyone about it.
Reported Type of Abuse or Neglect:	Sexual
Reports to Public Authorities with dates:	
Comments:	Verified student's attendance at the school from 1966 – 1974 through the department of Catholic Schools. Victim asked to be referred to Archdiocesan Counsel. REDACTED to contact victim.
Report initiated by:	REDACTED